BIBLIOTHECA
FF. PRÆDICATORUM
CONVENTUS
CIVIT. BENITIÆ
Lit. B. 9
Pl. 2

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/canonofoldtestam0000unse

THE CANON

OF

THE OLD TESTAMENT,

BY

TOBIAS MULLEN,

Bishop of Erie.

St. Albert's College Library

"I, for my part, would not believe the Gospel, unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me to it."

S. Aug. Contra Ep. Man. Fund.

1892.

FR. PUSTET,

Printer to the Holy Apostolic See and the S. Congregation of Rites.

FR. PUSTET & CO.,

NEW YORK.

"Entered according to act of Congress in the year 1888, by
TOBIAS MULLEN,
In the office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington."

N. Y. C. PROTECTORY PRINT,
WEST CHESTER, N. Y.

PREFACE.

Western Christendom is still infested with the plague of religious controversy, a baneful heritage transmitted to the present age by certain theologians of the sixteenth century. That heritage has in too many instances led long ago to deeds of violence and bloodshed disgraceful not only to all who encouraged them, but particularly so, to those forms of religious belief in whose behalf they were perpetrated. Christians, however, convinced that those who sought in that way to force their opinions upon others, were generally unsuccessful; and that any appeal to pains and penalties for such a purpose only exposed the inherent weakness of the cause in support of which it was made, learned at last while differing in opinion, to practice, if not mutual respect, at least mutual forbearance. As a consequence religious wars waged for the purpose of maintaining, or suppressing some form of Christian belief, have long ceased to embroil with each other the Kingdoms of Europe, or even to affect in any way their mutual relations. There now neighbor meets neighbor and discusses the relative merits of their respective creeds, without uttering an offensive or even an unkind word. It is much the same in the New World. Thus the plague of controversy as it once raged, has (praised be God), been stayed at last, and, let us hope, forever.

So far as religious strife is concerned, the present compared with any age that has passed since the sixteenth century is, therefore, eminently one of peace and good will; one in which men generally recognize the

good traits possessed by others, and accord to them their full rights even though not in sympathy with their doctrinal principles. Nevertheless the spirit of controversy still survives, and must survive, so long as truth is combated by error, and good confronted by evil. Several of the old controversies have, indeed, been almost forgotten, or been divested of the interest they once possessed. And many a creed in which its first professors could discern no flaw, has been found by those, who now belong to the same sect, to be more or less inconsistent with reason and revelation. As a symbol it no longer expresses their belief, and sooner or latter must be recast, in order to adapt it to views far too humane, too rational and too Christian for its authors to have entertained, much less approved, dominated as they were by polemical prejudices and the stern dictates of sectional rancor. Such movements may tend to narrow the field of controversy, but cannot close it altogether; until Christendom shall have become what it once was, and what it ought to be still, *one fold and one shepherd.*

Among the many points of controversy, which have kept Christendom divided into two principal camps for nearly four hundred years, is that which forms the subject of the following volume. That controversy, like others originating at the same time, has been conducted by many in a way, which showed that they were more anxious for factional ascendancy than for the triumph of divine truth. On the Catholic side of the discussion hardly has anything been written in English beyond a few pages, though the subject has been exhaustively treated by Catholic scholars. But these scholars generally wrote in Latin, their works being intended principally for the use of ecclesiastical students, who, when afterwards charged as Pastors with the care of souls, would thus be prepared to teach the Faithful whatever it was necessary to know regarding the Sacred Scripture.

However, once the Canon of Scripture was solemnly proclaimed, the unanimity with which that decision was received by the Catholic laity made it unnecessary to explain to the people in detail the reasons, on which it was based; and this the more so, as all were aware that the contents of the Bible remained substantially unchanged. What Catholics found, for example, in the Bible of the sixteenth and subsequent centuries, they found in the Bible of the fifteenth and preceding centuries. For them therefore little instruction on the subject was necessary, beyond what they already actually knew. They believed in the Church. The Church had solemnly approved, as a canon of Scripture, a catalogue of sacred books universally used by her in her divine offices already for ages. In what she had thus done, she, as infallible, could be no more mistaken than she was in inculcating the existence and unity of God. All this the laity, as well as their teachers, knew full well. What use then in wasting time on the *why* or the *how* of the decision in question? That decision once made, stands forever. And that is all there is about it.

It was far otherwise with those, who at the time had revolted against the authority of the Church. Regarding the *Canon of Scripture* they not only disagreed with her but with each other, and their followers do so to this day. Yet they none the less prepared to assail her, as well on account of the *Canon* she had approved, as on account of other dogmas she retained but they rejected. Volume after volume was issued from the English press, with the single object of proving, that certain books in the Bible, which the Church pronounced authentic, were not only human but doctrinally and historically objectionable. So unscrupulous were the authors of those volumes in their statements, that subsequent writers of the same school felt compelled, as a matter of justice, to correct their misstatements, or apologize for their dishon-

esty. Unfortunately the work of one of these unscrupulous censors, a member of the anglican episcopate, has been treated on the continent of Europe and in the United States as possessed of the highest authority on the question it discusses, its arguments being regarded as unassailable and its conclusions accepted as irrefragible. Yet, a learned Professor in the University of Oxford, long ago, pointed out several gross and apparently deliberate misstatements in the work. And another dignitary in the Anglican communion, within the last ten or eleven years, warned the public against it, saying it "must be read with great caution."

The discussion, which has for its subject *The Canon of scripture*, like almost every other, which the present has inherited from the sixteenth century, has been recently conducted in a spirit far different from that, in which it originated, or from that which marked its history for ages afterwards. There is no longer as there once was among the advocates of the contracted Canon, a disposition to deduce from the writings of any Father other conclusions than such, as are warranted by these writings considered as a whole. For these advocates have discovered, and some of them have expressly admitted, that not a few of such writings are characterized by inconsistencies not to say contradictions. In fact, the canon which any individual Father followed is, as the most advanced critics now hold, not to be ascertained so much from isolated passages in his works or from any catalogue he may have formulated, as from the manner in which he may have referred to the books of Scripture, and the use he has made of them throughout his writings. Nor will the reader often now find what was once so common among the advocates of the same contracted canon, writers urging against some of the Old Testament deutero-canonical books objections, which, boomerang-like, recoiling on their projectors, would if

admitted have been fatal to books in their own canon, and have furnished infidels with weapons wherewith to assail revelation in general. Writers of that class warned of their folly by critics of their own school have become all but extinct.

There were several considerations which induced the writer to undertake the following work. But they may all be reduced to two. In the first place he was anxious to counteract the effect, which the almost constant publication of certain English books in Great Britain and this country, on the canon of Scripture, might have among his own people. It is well known, that the persistent attacks of infidels on the views held by Protestants regarding their Bible, has made it necessary for its defenders to vindicate, as best they may, its claim to the veneration of those who still regard it as the only infallible rule of belief and practice. The volumes that have been thus written in its defence are legion, and almost every year adds to their number. To this no Christian could object. But the authors of some of these volumes, not content with attempting to establish the canonical character of the books retained in the Protestant Bible, go farther and endeavor to convince their readers that the other books contained in the Douay Bible are unscriptural, or as they generally express it, *apocryphal.* Now these volumes in defence of the Protestant Bible, may be found in the shelves of many book-sellers from whom Catholics are accustomed to obtain their works of instruction and devotion, and who may thus be introduced to a class of literature antagonistic to divine revelation. To prepare such people for an introduction of that kind seemed a work of charity and a tribute to truth. This single reason might in itself be an apology for writing a work on *The Canon of the Old Testament.* But, in the second place, there was another reason which led to the belief, that the labor devoted to such a work might not

be labor lost. Several of the attempts made of late by eminent Protestant scholars to strengthen or restore that attachment to the Bible, which was at least once so characteristic of our separated brethren, exhibited on their part a strong suspicion,—the result, no doubt, of candid and independent inquiry,—that the Protestant canon of the Old Testament, after all that had been written in its favor, was really defective. Indeed it has been actually admitted at least in one instance, that that canon requires to be readjusted, though in making this admission the writer seems to have had little hope, that the readjustment would be accomplished. Another confesses that the authors of that canon placed thereon books which should have been excluded in favor of others, which they rejected as *apocryphal;* while several other critics belonging to the same school, candidly allow, that the Church at the Council of Trent admitted to the canon only such books, as had been in general use from time immemorial. To assist such men in their efforts at grasping in its fulness the written revelation which God has made to mankind, seems to excuse, if it cannot justify, the time spent and the labor undergone in collecting and arranging the materials for the following pages.

In the composition of a work like the following, as a matter of course, writers belonging to different ages and different countries had to be consulted. Often it became necessary also to reproduce some of their statements. But it will be observed, and perhaps be regretted by some that though the authors of many of these statements did not write in English, the extracts made from their works are almost invariably presented to the reader in that language alone. It would indeed have been easy to insert among the foot notes or in an appendix all such extracts, exactly as they appear in the works to which they belong. But to have done so would have resulted in an inconveniently bulky volume, and involved the

proof-reader in serious trouble, situated as he was some five hundred miles from the printers. Besides, as in the end, there was nothing to be gained, but much certain to be lost by misrepresenting what had been written by others, the purpose throughout has been to substitute an honest English equivalent for all such extracts. And it is hoped the reader will find, that in no instance has that purpose been forgotten. Furthermore, English readers may be divided into two classes,—those who understand other languages than English and those who do not. For the former a different course in the matter under consideration, from that which has been followed, was not necessary, as many of them are supplied with the means of testing the accuracy of the versions referred to. To the latter nothing has been lost by not being supplied with the originals of those versions, as those originals if inserted would not have been understood by them.

With these preliminary remarks, the volume itself is respectfully submitted to the judgment of an impartial and intelligent public.

June 12th, 1891.

CONTENTS.

Bible—Meaning of the word. Canon—What is implied thereby. Names of the Sacred Books. Old and New Testament—What is meant by the distinction. The Catholic Canon—Number of Books contained therein. The Sacred Books divided into several classes. Other books not Sacred—their origin and character. Of all the Books whether really or only professedly parts of the Bible, as referred to by the Fathers, a quadruple division may be made. *Apocryphal*—its meaning, how applied by early Christian writers. *Ecclesiastical* as used by Rufinus. *Canonical* and *Canonized*—what is and was meant thereby. Catalogues of the Sacred Books—their origin and value. *Protocanonical* and *Deuterocanonical* Books—the import and origin of these terms—the Deutero-canonical Books designated. . . 1

CHAPTER II.

Jewish Canon—Number and Names of Books thereon. Various enumerations of these Books. Jews divided their Books into three classes—the number in the first class constant, that in each of the other two classes variable, though at least in recent times the contents of their Bible always the same—how classified by the author of Ecclesiasticus—how by our Lord—how by Josephus. The relation of Esdras to the Canon as described in the Scriptures—as alleged by the Jews themselves. The earliest reference to the point found in apocryphal iv Esdras. The statement in iv Esdras considered. Degree of credit given to that statement by early Christian writers. The Scriptures not destroyed in the Babylonian captivity. . 15

CHAPTER III.

Origin of their Canon as described by the Jews. The Talmud—its reference to the formation of the Canon. The College of Esdras. The Sanhedrim or Great Synagogue. Its existence denied for various reasons. Josephus on the subject. Opinions of Christian writers. Why the Jewish Canon could not have been the work of Esdras. 32

CHAPTER IV.

Difference of opinion between Catholic and Protestant writers regarding the relation of Esdras to the Canon. Difficulties connected with the subject. Theories advocated by Catholic writers in reference to it—Genebrard, Serarius, Richard Simon, Huet, Frassen, Movers, Netteler, Danko, Addis and Arnold. Theories maintained by Protestant writers on the same subject. Prideaux and Davidson. Various reasons for believing that Esdras had nothing whatever to do with the Canon of Scripture. . . 50

CHAPTER V.

The assembly at Jamnia. Debate thereat on the Canon. Influence of the debate on Protestant opinion. Catholic belief not affected thereby, but expressed mainly in three forms. The Septuagint or Alexandrine version. Its origin, circulation and authority—In general use outside Palestine, but read even in the Synagogue at Jerusalem. Jerusalem a centre of unity for Jews throughout the world. The Temple of Leontopolis—The Jews who worshipped there recognized as orthodox at Jerusalem, while their Bible contained the Deutero Books. That same Bible delivered by the Apostles to the first Christians. It, or versions of it containing the deutero books, the only Bible in the hands of Christians until 1536. The Latin Vulgate, its origin. It also contained the Deutero books according to Protestant testimony. Two points settled The bond of union between the Palestinian and Hellenistic Jews.. 68

CHAPTER VI.

The credit of formulating a canon due more to Jeremias and Nehemias than to Esdras. Its real author the Jewish high Priest. This proved by the Scriptures, the testimony of Josephus, and by the course which Jewish writers supposed was adopted in translating the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek. 87

CHAPTER VII.

Temple at Garizim contrasted with that at Leontopolis. The former execrated, the latter at least tolerated by the Palestinian Jews. Towards the end of the Hebrew Theocracy the high Priests at Jerusalem guilty of awful crimes. Those at Leontopolis charged with no disorders. Probable effect of the contrast on pious Jews. Reasons for believing that the books used by the Egyptian Jews were adopted by those of Palestine. A canon though incomplete in existence in the time of Moses, gradually enlarged by the high Priest. Interference of the civil power with the high Priest. The appointment to that office of

men without any title to it. As a consequence the canon becomes vague and confused among the Palestinian Jews soon after the beginning of the Christian era. Until that period the books received by the Hellenists also received by the Palestinians. Then only did the Rabbins decide to mutilate their canon by excluding therefrom certain books all along used not only by the Hellenists, but by the Palestinians. 106

CHAPTER VIII.

The decision reached at Jamnia not final. The usurpers of the authority possessed alone by the high Priest of the old, but already transferred to the High Priests of the new Dispensation, still in doubt about their canon. This proved by the testimony of Melito, Justin Martyr and others. The Jews without a fixed canon from the Apostolic age until the fifth century, when they at last agreed on one which however was false. The uncertainty among the Jews about the canon increased by their efforts at meeting the arguments of Christians. The attempt of the Rabbins at curtailing the canon more successful than that of the Protestant Doctors. Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. 125

CHAPTER IX.

The Septuagint a formidable weapon in the hands of the Christians when arguing with Jews. The latter charged with attempting to corrupt it. What happened the Book of Esther. The Jewish Canon not now what it was in the time of Christ. The general theory advocatad by Protestants on this subject. Luther tossing Esther into the Elbe. Contradictory propositions must be maintained by all Christians who hold that the true canon of the Old Testament is to be found only in the Hebrew Bible. 141

CHAPTER X.

A Second Theory proposed on the same subject by Catholic critics. Was there really an Esdrine Canon, not closed however but by the authority of Christ and his Apostles? Testimony of the Manuscripts. Intermixture of Proto and Deutero books. Septuagint when delivered to the Church contained the Deutero books. Events in the early Christian Church at Jerusalem. Primitive sectarists though they repudiated some of the Proto Books, never objected to the Deutero. These considerations fatal to the theory in question. . . 148

CHAPTER XI.

A Third Theory defended by Catholic writers. Were there two Canons—A Palestinian or Esdrine, and an Alexandrine—the former the work of Esdras and Nehemias – restricted to Palestine and not closed

until the time of the Apostles. Thelatter followed outside of Palestine and containing the Deutero as well as the Proto books? This theory untenable on account of the communion maintained between the Palestinian and Hellenistic Jews. It is besides contradicted by the constitution of the Hebrew commonwealth. Statement of Bonfrere. The canon now used by the Jews quite different from the one they had in times immediately preceding the Christian era. 159

CHAPTER XII.

Flavius Josephus—his character and writings. Extract therefrom. Value of this extract in determining the contents of the Hebrew canon. Critics irrespective of creed unable to agree in deciding what books now in the Jewish canon found a place among the thirteen historical books, and four of hymns and counsels mentioned by Josephus. All the books on the existing Jewish Canon not made use of by Josephus in his writings. Of other books not on that canon he has copied portions. For example deutero parts of Esther, Esdras III and Machabees. The Catholic and Protestant Esther contrasted. Vicissitudes through which the book of Esther has passed. These vicissitudes accounted for. 165

CHAPTER XIII.

Statement of Josephus further discussed. Succession and mission of the Prophets. Flavian "succession of Prophets." Whence did Josephus derive his information on the subject? According to his own statements and those of the Scripture there were several well known prophets between the time of Artaxexes and his own age. Josephus contradicted by himself—by the writers of the New Testament—by Philo Judaeus and by the authors of the Talmud. Various grades of prophecy. Meaning of the Flavian "succession of prophets" uncertain. Interpreted in one way these words not inconsistent with the divine origin claimed for the Deutero books. Interpreted otherwise as a source of testimony they are of little account. And why. Rabbins and Reformers well paired. 180

CHAPTER XIV.

The Canon of the Schismatics. What is meant by a Schismatic. The Syrians excepted, all Christians received at first the Septuagint or a version of it, and with it the Deutero books. These books ever used by the Roman See. As to them never any difference between Latins and Greeks. The Canon at the Council in Trullo and the Council of Florence. Joasaph II Schismatical patriarch of Constantinople sends a deacon to Wittenberg. Melanchthon's letter to the patriarch. Correspondence between the Tübingen divines and Jeremias II, schismatical

patriarch of Constantinople. Four folio volumes of Lutheran sermons fail to make any impression on the obdurate Greeks. . . 196

CHAPTER XV.

Cyril Lucar. His birth and education—visits Genoa—is introduced to Protestant society—is ordained—comes in contact with the Jesuits—is made patriarch of Alexandria—favors Calvinism—opens a correspondence with leading Protestants—has several students (among them Metrophanes Critopulus) educated in Protestant institutions—is promoted to the Patriarchal See of Constantinople—ably sustained there by the English, Dutch, and Swedish ambassadors—troubled by the Jesuits but contrives to get rid of them—writes a confession of faith—is suspected of high treason—repeatedly degraded and restored—is at last arrested and strangled, his dead body being thrown into the sea—soon after his death anathematized in a Greek Synod as a Lutheran. Metrophanes Critopulus writes a confession of faith—is promoted to the patriarchal See of Alexandria, and unites with other schismatical dignitaries in blasting with censure the memory of his unfortunate patron—Cyril Lucar. The canon of Scripture advocated by Cyril and Metrophanes. Decrees on the subject by several councils composed of Greek schismatics, not at all what Cyril's protestant patrons expected. 205

CHAPTER XVI.

Source of Russian Christianity. SS. Cyril and Methodius. Invention of the Slavonic alphabet. Slavonic version of the Scripture. It contained the Deutero books, the Septuagint or Vulgate being the standard after which it was modelled. The progress of Christianity slow among the Russians until the end of the tenth century. Vladimir, their ruler is baptized. With the aid of missionaries from Constantinople he accomplishes the conversion of his subjects. The Russian church at its creation in communion with Rome. Homage done to the Pope by Vladimir's grandson for his kingdom. The council of Florence. The Russian church represented thereat. The act of union adopted then by Latins and Greeks subsequently rejected by the latter. Sad picture presented under the Sultan by the proud prelates who violated the compact they had solemnly signed at Florence. The act of union also repudiated by the Russians. Dismal condition of the Russian hierarchy under the Czars. The Greeks had ruptured the union which bound them to Rome. The Russians in turn broke loose from Constantinople. Present state of religion in Russia. 217

CHAPTER XVII.

Russian divines on the Canon. Peter Mogila—his "Exposition of the

Faith of the Russian Church." George Konissky—his treatise "On the duty of Parish Priests." Philaret—his "Catechism." Statements by Protestant and Catholic writers. Hody on the "Muscovite Bible." Reuss on "the Greek Bible printed at Moscow in 1821." Cornely on "Russian Bibles edited and approved by the Synod of St. Petersburg in 1876." A Russian Bible printed in 1882 at St. Petersburg with the benediction of "the Most Holy Orthodox Synod." The Non-Jurors of Great Britain solicit recognition by the Schismatical Greek, and Russian churches. By the former they are required to surrender at discretion. Negotiations with the latter finally arrested by the death of Peter the Great. Similar efforts recently made by British and American Episcopalians. What followed. Döllinger invites a conference to Bonn. It is attended by a few ministers and Russo-Greeks, each one representing nobody but himself. The points discussed thereat. What came of it. A second Bonn Conference. Dollingerites and Anglicans ready to barter away their creed. The Russo-Greeks instead of meeting the others half way haughtily decline to make the smallest concession. As to the canon of the Old Testament the agreement reached at Bonn when fairly interpreted favors the canonicity of the Deutero books. . . . 228

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Canon of the Old Testament among the other Schismatical Communities. The Nestorians. The Abyssinians. The Armenians. The Copts and others of Egypt. The Melchites. The Jacobites, etc. Renaudot on the question. Admissions of Walton, Wright, Welhausen, and Marsh. The Deutero books canonical, because the schismatics who so receive them, must have been taught to believe this by those who whether Apostles or successors of the Apostles were the first to deliver to them the word of God. . . . 250

CHAPTER XIX.

The Canon among the Sects. Meaning of *Sect.* The Canon among the Jewish Sects. Samaritans, Sadducees, Pharisees. The Canon among the Christian Sects of the first century—Simon Magus, Saturninus, Basilides, Cerinthus, Ebion. The Canon among the sects of the second century—Elcesaeus, Cerdo, Marcion, Tatian, Montanus, Apelles. The Canon among the sects of the third century—Manes, Tertullian, Simonians, Basilidians, Marcionites, Manicheans, Nazarites, Valentinians, Ebionites, Cataphrygians, Alogians, Gnostics, etc. The Canon among the sects of the fourth and fifth centuries—Arians, Pelagians, Eunomians, Anomæans, Vigilantius. The Canon among the sects from the sixth to the tenth century During this period the spirit of error was so occupied with other innovations, that the canon of

Scripture escaped its notice. The Canon among the sects of the eleventh century—Bogomilists, Stephen and Lisosius. The Canon among the sects of the twelfth century—Albigenses and Cathari, Waldensians. The Canon among the sects of the thirteenth century—Abbot Joachim, Albigensians still engaged in manufacturing a new Canon. 264

CHAPTER XX.

The Canon among the sects from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century. John Wyckliffe—effects of his errors—ignorant of Greek or Hebrew. His canon of Scripture doubtful. So also is the English translation of the Scripture he is reported to have written. The point discussed by Davidson, mentioned in *Dublin Review*, considered in *Book of Days*, referred to by Hallam, treated by Marsh, seriously doubted by Stevenson. The Canon among the sects of the fifteenth century. Herman Ruissvich. The Canon among the sects of the sixteenth century. A horde of heretics. The foremost Martin Luther. His summary rejection of many books belonging to the Old and New Testaments. Davidson's estimate of Martin's argument against the Apocalypse. Martin Chemnitz, Johann Brentz, the Centuriators of Magdeburg though favorable to Luther's views, defend the Apocalypse. Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Scaliger, Salmasius, Semler, Bolten, Michaelis make sad havoc of the Canon. Vigorous protests from conservative Protestants as well as Catholics against the sacrilegious treatment of that venerable instrument. . . 275

CHAPTER XXI.

Merits of Luther's Bible. 'Tis condemned by Emser. Luther's abuse of his censor. Luther's Bible also severely censured by his fellow reformers. Its deliberate perversions of the plain sense contained in the original. These perversions perpetrated to justify Luther's errors. Examples of such perversions. Calvin's Bible condemned by Dumoulin, a French Calvinistic minister. Œcolampadius' pronounced impious by Beza the successor of Calvin. Beza's Latin New Testament denounced by Walton, Dumoulin, and MacKnight. English Protestant Bibles. Tyndale's Bible modelled after Luther's. Coverdale's "Bible . . . faithfully and truly translated" as its author boasted "out of Douche and Latin." Matthew's Bible, simply a revision of Tyndale's as far as the latter went, the remainder of its Old Testament being the work of John Rogers and probably Coverdale. Taverner's Bible no more than Matthew's corrected. Cranmer's Bible simply a revision of the Bible by Tyndale and Rogers. The Geneva or *Breeches* Bible no more than a revision of Cranmer's Bible.

The Bishop's Bible but another revision of Cranmer's Bible. In all these Bibles the Deutero Books, either by the name given them or the position assigned them in the Old Testament, treated as inferior to the rest. 291

CHAPTER XXII.

The English Protestant Bibles condemned by the best English Protestant scholars. A new version ordered by King James I. It is completed in 1611, is styled "the authorized version." Its character—the result of a compromise between the two factions of which the translators were composed. But both agreed so to pervert the sense of the original that Catholics would appear idolaters. The way this was accomplished. Perverse and shameless use of the word *image* by King James' scholars. 308

CHAPTER XXIII.

The latest Revisers of "the authorized version" loath to renounce the advantage so basely acquired by the anti-scriptural use of the word *image*. Jacob's *Sheol*. The New Testament of "the authorized version" mainly Martin Luther's. "Diana of the Ephesians'. Perversion of Mat. xix. 11. Luther's sermon on Marriage suggests a twist of I. Cor. vii. 9. "The use of the cup" enjoined by perverting the meeting of I. Cor. xi. 27. A belief in Purgatory prevented by corrupting Luke I. 72. King James' Translaters while they had one eye on the original, with the other never lost sight of the Pope. Hebrews x. 38 falsified to prove "once just, always just." Adam Clarke's remark thereon. Perversion of II. Tim. iii. 16. Protestant preference for Old Testament names. Silly attempt of the Reformers to perpetuate the Hebrew vocalization of Old Testament names—while the Hebrews themselves when writing these names for other than Hebrew scholars, adapt them to the vocalization of their readers. . . 321

CHAPTER XXIV.

Nomenclature of "the authorized Version" less Hebraic than that of some German reformers. The Revisers of that version try to find out the system of transliteration followed by the translators. In vain, for apart from a settled purpose to make the Bible endorse protestant and condemn Catholic principles the translators had no system. Their versatility in writing names. The two factions engaged in swapping words and passages. Their use or rather abuse of the words *diakonos presbuteros* and *episcopos*. Scriptural meaning of these terms—The Anglo-Saxon *priost*, the Latin *sacerdos*, the Greek *hiereus* and the Hebrew *cohen* synonymous. Not however, until the close of the

second century was the Christian *priest* called a *sacerdos* among the Latins or a *hiereus* among the Greeks. Reason for the discipline. *Priest* implies essentially a *sacrificer*. Applied to those generally recognized as *ministers*, it is unappropriate, misleading, fraudulent and false. 341

CHAPTER XXV.

A Reviewer of the revised version of the New Testament, who assisted in that work, reviewed. "A vast multitude of changes made in "the authorized version." Specimens of these changes. "The authorized version" declared by a Reviser erroneous, absurd," etc., though the Revisers as a body find language inadequate to depict the beauties of the volume. The translators had ample means for writing a faithful version. But that they did not propose doing. The Revisers like the Translators composed of two factions. The result also a compromise. Many archaic words and ungrammatical expressions allowed to reremain. Public expectation of the coming revision aroused to the highest pitch wherever the English language was spoken, but only to collapse under bitter disappointment. Book-sellers and publishers for a while reap a rich harvest. But a reaction soon set in. The market became glutted—Retailers found at last copies could not be sold at any price. No demand for the revised version of the Old Testament when it appeared. Use made of the Revision. A question of Profit and Loss. 365

CHAPTER XXVI.

The Anglo Catholic Version, commonly called the Douay Bible. An account of it. Its basis the vulgate, a copy highly esteemed by Protestant scholars. The literary qualifications of those to whom English readers owe the Douay Bible. The version commended by Protestant critics for "its scrupulous accuracy and fidelity." Fault found with it on account of its Hebraisms. Latinisms and Græcisms. This accounted for. Wherever the sense of the original seemed doubtful the version strictly literal. An example of this. Striking contrast between the judgment of Hallam and that of the Revisers regarding the language of the "authorized Version." In the case of words whose meaning in the original seemed obscure the authors of the Douay simply transcribed such often without any change whatever. *Sindon* cited as an illustration of this. Though honored with the sanction of not a single Bishop the Douay Version deservedly regarded in its day as the most valuable contribution then made to English Catholic literature. 380

CHAPTER XXVII.

A brief account of the Revisions and editions through which the Douay Version passed in Great Britain and Ireland. Objectionable notes in the Douay Version. McNamara's unfortunate speculation. Nary's Version of the Vulgate New Testament. Witham's revision of the same. Challoner's labors on the Douay Version. Kenrick and Newman on changes made in the language of the Douay Version by Challoner. Lingard's Translation of the four Gospels. . . 399

CHAPTER XXVIII.

What has been done by Catholics for the circulation of the Scriptures in the United States. Revisions and editions of the Douay Bible there. McNamara's edition of the Douay Bible re-issued under Protestant auspices at New York. Object and failure of the speculation. French, German and Spanish Catholic Versions of the Vulgate published in the United States under Episcopal sanction. The same versions with a Catholic Portuguese one but all mutilated or modified in some way edited by the American bible society. An attempt to force into circulation among Catholics a Lutheran bible by inserting therein the title page of a German Catholic Bible. Similar tricks employed by the Protestant bible societies in the Old as well as the New world to shove among Catholics counterfeits of God's Holy Word. Some statistics of sales of Catholic Bibles in the United States. . 413

CHAPTER XXIX.

Since types were substituted for pens, Bibles multiplied by the Church not only in English but in all languages spoken by Christian nations. German Catholic Bibles, French Catholic Bibles, Italian Catholic Bibles, Spanish Catholic Bibles, Portuguese Catholic Bibles, Flemish Catholic Bibles, Polish Catholic Bibles, Bohemian Catholic Bibles, Slavonian Catholic Bibles, Hungarian Catholic Bibles, Syriac Catholic Bibles, Arabic Catholic Bibles, Egyptian Catholic Bibles, Armenian Catholic Bibles. Portions of the Catholic Old and New Testament translated into some of the languages and dialects spoken by the aborigines of the New World. Under the sanction and blessing of the Church, Greek and Latin Versions of the Scriptures collated corrected and copied again and again. Look at those venerable and precious manuscripts which we still possess. Well these are generally the productions of a class of men, for whom modern sciolists have no better name than that of "Lazy Monks." 435

CHAPTER XXX.

The general circulation of the Scriptures before the invention of the

printing press impossible for two reasons—prevalent illiteracy arising from irruptions of the Barbarians: (examples of this illiteracy), and the enormous expense of books; (instances of this)—Yet not only the existence but the contents of the Bible, well known all along through the public readings and explanations of the Epistles and Gospels in the Churches. Maitland's exposure of D'Aubigne's and Milner's falsehoods about Luther's pretended discovery of the Bible. Yet the falsehood repeatedly edited by D'Aubigne's Protestant admirers, while allowing Maitland's masterly refutation to go out of print. This, however, the uniform policy of the party ever since it was organized by Luther. Latin very generally understood in Western Christendom until the time of Luther. With it as a means of access to the Vulgate, that sacred volume could not have been generally unknown. For long after the time of Luther Latin was the usual channel through which even Protestant scholars expressed their thoughts. A list of such scholars. A practical knowledge of Latin possessed occasionally even by ladies and laborers. 446

CHAPTER XXXI.

The Introduction of the Bible to England coeval with the preaching of the Gospel in that country. Statement of Gildas. Testimony of Venerable Bede. Usher on the point. Tradition regarding Venerable Bede Alcuin and King Alfred. An early English Psalter. Cuthbert's Evangelistarium. The Rushworth Gospels. The Heptateuch of Aelfric, Archbishop of Canterbury. The Deutero Books of the Old Testament in use. Anglo Saxon Psalters and Gospels preserved in British Museum and elsewhere, some of them as late as the twelfth century. The counterfeit Versions attributed to Wyckliffe and his associates well preserved. The why of this easily explained. But from the twelfth century to the year 1582, the date of the Douay Version not a single scrap of any English Version by any Catholic pen remains. The why in this case furnished by the wholesale destruction to which every relic of Catholic antiquity in England was doomed by Henry VIII and his rapacious inquisitors. Several instances of this awful sacrilege cited on the authority of Protestant writers, some of whom profited by it. . 462

CHAPTER XXXII.

The sacred Scriptures profoundly esteemed in England while the country remained Catholic. A dilemma for Hartwell Horne and all of his school. His assertion about a chasm during which the Scriptures were buried in oblivion contradicted by More, Cranmer, Fox and Common Sense. Even in the worst of times while England remained Catholic its people possessed Versions of the Gospels and Epistles, Histories of the

Sacred Passion, Psalters and numerous ascetic books. Various instances of the profound esteem with which the divine Scriptures were regarded in Catholic England. Maitland on this subject. Catholic England adorned the Bible as an unsullied Bride. Protestant England has treated it as a common Harlot. . . . 473

CHAPTER XXXIII.

If after the tenth century no translation of the Bible was made for a long time in England: that accounted for by the inroads of the Danes, the Norman Conquest, the extinction of the Saxon language and the slow growth of a new one. But above all by the general destruction of Catholic writings at the reformation. Yet Horne's imaginary chasm easily filled by what must have been the literary labors of such scholars as Lanfranc, Anselm, Langton, Grosseteste, John of Salisbury, Richard of St. Victor, etc. Horne's charge that the general reading of the Scriptures was prohibited by "the Papal See" utterly groundless. Innocent III and the bible readers of Metz. Frederic Von Hurter's view of the case. Innocent III and the Albigensians. The Pontiff's policy on that occasion vindicated. Decree by the Council of Toulouse regarding the Scriptures. Action on the same subject by the Council of Tarragona and the Synod of Oxford under Thomas Arundel. English Catholics never forbidden to read faithful versions of the Scriptures. Prohibitory rules on the subject temporary, local and the result of exceptional circumstances. Practice of the Apostles regarding the matter. Autocrats of the Common Schools. Millions spent in the distribution of Protestant bibles, which the recipients generally utilize for all such purposes as those to which waste paper is applied. . 483

CHAPTER XXXIV.

Bible Societies. Their origin and purposes. Opposed by several Anglican Bishops, and by Bretschneider with several other leading German Protestants, but encouraged by Leander Van Ess, a German Priest. The Societies condemned by several Popes. Engaged in the distribution of counterfeits of Catholic Bibles. Novel method of translating the Scriptures into foreign languages. Character of these translations. The use made of them. Position assigned the Deutero Old Testament books in early Protestant bibles offensive to English dissenters, not so to continental Protestants. Karl Hildebrand Canstein's bibles an occasion of scandal to the Kirk O'Scotland. Strife among the Brethren. The sixteen years' Apocryphal war. A free for all fight in London, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Paris, Saltzburg, Berlin, Stockholm and Petersburgh. Van Ess and the Deutero books sacrificed as a peace offering to the intolerant spirit of Scotch Presbyterianism. The difference be-

tween the treatment which the Catholic Bible receives from Catholics and that which the Protestant bible receives from Protestants well expressed in the contrast between the reverential attitude of Moses as he stood awe-struck by the voice from the burning bush, and the daring deeds of Heli's sons when they dragged the ark into the field of battle. 499

CHAPTER XXXV.

Rules of the Index regarding the reading of the Scriptures. These rules dictated by a due consideration of the evils attributable to the indiscriminate use of the Bible. The existence of these evils not only proved by Catholic writers, but admitted and deplored by intelligent Protestants, and even by the reformers themselves. The victims of indiscriminate bible reading still numerous. Composed of imposters, fanatics and fools. Modern methods of treating them. Instances of recent outrages by them in the United States. For most readers Bible histories, like those prepared for the medieval Christians, more useful and certainly less dangerous than the Bible. Declaration of the British Hierarchy in 1826, regarding the reading of the Bible. A similar Declaration the same year by the Irish Hierarchy. Decree of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore on the subject. That decree approved by Pius IX, who exhorts the American Hierarchy to prepare as correct an edition as possible of the English Bible then in use. 514

CHAPTER XXXVI.

Long before the invention of the printing press the Bible or portions of it translated into the language of each Christian country. While this was being done no distinction made between Proto and Deutero books. Germany favored with a version in the fourth century. France's earliest known version belongs to the eleventh century. Italy's first version appeared in the thirteenth century. Spain received its first in the same century. Portugal its first about the same time. Flanders received the Scriptures in its own language a few years earlier. Poland had the Bible translated into its own language not until the fourteenth century. Bohemia was supplied with a version of the New Testament about the beginning of the fifteenth century. Sweden had the Bible in its own language in the fourteenth century. Iceland possessed a version about a century before that. Hungary was provided with at least portions of a version about the same time. Slavonia traces its first version to the ninth century. Ireland certainly blessed with a version in the fourteenth century and probably with versions of parts of the bible several centuries before that. All these with versions in other languages made long before the birth of Luther, or the introduction of

the printing press. All this accomplished under the influence of the Church in the absence of all rivalry and opposition. . . 535

CHAPTER XXXVII.

The Canon of Scripture proclaimed by Protestants in their Confessions of Faith. *Anglican Articles of Religion*—at first 42, reduced to 39. *Article VI* untrue, so admitted by Anglicans. *Helvetic confession of Faith*—the work of Beza. Its appeal to St. Augustine. *The Gallic confession of Faith*—appeal to the *Spirit*. *The Belgic confession of Faith*—of a class with the Belgic. *Waldensian confession of Faith*—a confessed forgery. *The Confession of the Dutch Churches* appeals to the Holy Ghost. Dutchmen sharp-sighted. *The Westminster Confession* like all the others rejects the Deutero books and maintains that the other books "are the Word of God because they are the Word of God."! *The Swiss Declaration* of 1675 insists that the Hebrew text as it stands, consonants, vowels, etc., is divinely inspired! According to the foremost Protestant scholars some of the deutero books better entitled to a place on the Canon than others placed thereon by the Reformers. 546

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

Protestant scholars on the Protestant plan of settling the Canon. Jeremiah Jones denounces that plan as "folly and madness." Richard Baxter "could never boast of any such testimony or light of the Spirit" by which other Protestants pretended to distinguish between canonical and Apocryphal writings. Robert Barclay insists that "it is impossible to prove the Canon by the Scriptures." John Whitaker an Anglican minister held that it belongs to the Church to discern between true and false Scripture. The *Spirit* a last ditch for Protestants when hard pressed on the Canon. Calvin's Celestial Revelations. According to Presbyterian theology, the Supreme Judge in controversies of religion is the Holy Ghost speaking in the Scriptures. . 560

CHAPTER XXXIX.

The principle on which every Protestant creed rests false and impracticable. The innovations of Luther productive of fatal fruits. Hallam on Luther's immoral and irreligious notions as well as his nasty and stupid brutality. Munzer and Knipperdolling. Reformers puzzled. One of two courses to be adopted. A renunciation of the right of private judgment or a return to Rome. A media via regarding the Canon proposed by Chemnitz and Bucer. Gaussen condemns the principle on which the Protestant canon rested and devises a theory of his own. That Theory as objectionable as any other Protestant theory on the subject. 568

CHAPTER XL.

Emanuel Swedenborg and Joe Smith on the Canon of Scripture. Swedenborg's reveries on religion. The original Reformers curtail the Canon of their fathers. Swedenborg curtailed theirs. They cut off six entire books. He more than thrice that number. His right to mutilate the Canon as good as theirs. His "divine science of correspondences" as reasonable as Calvin's "celestial revelations." Joseph Smith instead of curtailing enlarges the Protestant Canon. Brief sketch of this latest of Reformers. His book of Mormon, a composition as sacred in the opinion of his followers as King James' Bible in that of its Protestant admirers. Salt Lake the ecclesiastical centre of the "Latter Day Saints" as the Mormons call themselves. The Protestant countries of Europe their recruiting grounds. Lynch law applied to their missionaries in the Southern States. Polygamy enjoined on Joe by a special revelation. Mormon defence of that institution against the assaults of the "Gentiles." The treatment of the Bible among Americans. Its treatment among many belonging to the educated classes in Germany and Great Britain. . . . 577

CHAPTER XLI.

The Deutero Books Canonical, though they as well as some others received as such by Protestants not so called by some of the early Fathers. Why not so called by these Fathers. The Tridentine decree on the Canon of Scripture binding on all Catholics. It ought to be so on all to whom the Bible is a divine revelation. The binding force of that decree rests First on the fact, that it belongs to the Church to decide all questions pertaining to Faith and Morals—that fact proved. Second on the statement of the Fathers declaring that the right to distinguish between canonical and uncanonical writings is inherent in the Church—that statement shown to have been made. Third on the Infallibility of the Church—a point which all must admit who receive the Bible as the Word of God, else their belief is irrational, as will be proved in Chapter XLII. 589

CHAPTER XLII.

A rational belief in the *Canon* of Scripture implies that the Council of Trent was infallible in defining it. A canon of Scripture a collection of writings having God as its Author. Such a collection, to be taken for what it is, must be stamped by competent authority. That authority must be divine else it is insufficient. Mere human authority may produce conviction regarding the authenticity of human compositions. But when there is question of divine writings such authority is quite incompetent. The Books of Scripture cannot establish their own

canonicity, just as a man's will cannot demonstrate its genuineness. External testimony required in both cases. In the latter that testimoney may be human. In the former such testimony is worthless. For the documents in that case profess to be from God. Therefore, no one but God or His delegate can prove that that is the case. Whether the contents of the Bible are divine or human is a point on which God is silent. But all Christians insist that they are to be received as divine. There must, therefore, be some *one* to assure us that they are such. And that *one* must have authority from God to say so. That *one* is the Catholic Church which alone claims to speak in God's name. If that claim be not admitted, belief in the divinity of the Bible impossible, irrational. Many reasons why in this matter the Church should be taken at her word. These reasons stated. If the Church be not infallible, there is absolutely no motive for believing that there is a collection of divine writings, or that this or that book belongs to it. Concluding Remarks. 614

CHAPTER I.

The Bible.

Philosophy furnishes abundant reasons for believing in the existence of a personal God, as a purely spiritual, infinitely perfect, and necessary Being, who has created and governs all things. Theology proves by conclusive arguments that God has revealed to mankind, principally in *writing*, what they have to believe and practise. It is therefore taken for granted that both propositions are entitled to the rational assent of the reader, in order that a question suggested by the latter, and which is the subject of the present treatise, may be at once introduced and discussed. What is the *writing* in which God has made the revelation referred to?

The answer is, a volume commonly called the *Bible*, from the Greek word *Biblos*, signifying at present a *book*, but meaning originally the inner bark of the papyrus plant, out of which paper was made. *Biblia*—small books—is sometimes used to designate the *Bible*. This volume claims for itself such names as the *Scripture*,[1] the *Scriptures*,[2] the *Holy Book*,[3] the *Holy Books*,[4] the *Book of the Lord*,[5] the *Sacred Letters*,[6] but was also designated by some of the early Christian writers the *Instrument*,[7] the *Libraries*,[8] the *Pandect*,[9] and the *Divinely Inspired*

[1] Mark, xii, 10.
[2] Matt. xxi, 42.
[3] II. Mach. viii. 23
[4] I. Mach. xii. 9.
[5] Isaias, xxxiv. 16.
[6] II. Tim. iii. 15.
[7] Tertullian *contra Marc.* L. iv. c. 1.
[8] S. Jerome, *Præf. in Esther*, *Ep.* xlix., *ad Pamm.*, § 3.
[9] Cassiodorus, *de div., lect.* c. xiv.

Scriptures;[1] yet it has been more commonly referred to in ancient and modern times as *the Scripture* or *Scriptures*, often qualified by the word *Holy*, *Sacred*, or *Divine*. The volume in question consists of several compositions belonging to different dates, and originating with different authors, whom God employed for the purpose. Considered as a whole, and apart from all other writings, these compositions constitute what is called *The Canon of Scripture;* that is, a catalogue or collection of books, which the Jews always believed to have been written under divine influence, and which, with some additions, Christians have received as such. Why these books have been so called will now be made apparent.

The word *Canon*, at present found in the speech of almost every civilized nation, has been adopted from the Greek language, and is derived from the Greek *kane*, or *kanna*, a reed or cane. It therefore signified originally a *straight rod* or *pole*, and by degrees a *rule* or *line* for measuring, as well as a *standard* or *model*. It was and is still used to designate conciliar and Pontifical decrees, and clergymen attached to cathedrals or collegiate churches are known by the name of *Canons*, as being on the *list* or *catalogue* of those who have special functions to perform in connection with such institutions. The principal part of the Mass is also called the *Canon*, either because that part constitutes the fixed *rule* according to which the Holy Sacrifice is offered, or because it contains a *list* or *catalogue* of those who are commemorated therein.

In the Greek Scriptures the word is rarely met with, but when it does occur therein it has no reference to a catalogue or collection of sacred books. It is found in

[1] Amphilochius, *Carm. ad Seleuc.* Most of these names have been given to the Scriptures also by other early writers.

II. Cor. x. 13, 15, 16, where it refers to a *rule*, or to a *line* for fixing boundaries; and in Gal. vi. 16 as well as Philipp. iii. 16, implying there a doctrinal *rule*. And it appears that it is in this sense that the word is taken whenever it is employed by the Fathers of the first three centuries, in the West as well as in the East, the Latin *Regula* (rule) conveying the same idea as the Greek *Kanon*. Towards the close of the fourth century the custom of applying the word to a *catalogue*, or rather the entire *collection* of Sacred Books was introduced. For St. John Chrysostom [1] among the Greeks, and SS. Jerome [2] and Augustine [3] among the Latins, seem to have been the first to employ the word for that purpose. Since then the use commonly made of the word conveys the idea of an *index* or *catalogue* of those books which Christians revere as the word of God, and look upon, when properly understood, as a *rule* or *standard* (though not the only one) of belief and practice. Hence the *Books* of which the Bible is composed are called *canonical* or *canonized;* and their contents *Canonical Scripture*, an expression consecrated by not only ancient usage, [4] but Ecumenical sanction. [5]

The name of each of the Sacred Books among Christians is that of the writer, or such as denotes the character of its contents, or that of the persons to whom or about whom it was written. These books are also classified under different titles, according to the period within which they were written, and the nature of the subjects treated therein. Thus such of them as were written before the coming of Christ constitute the *Old Testament*, those written afterwards belong to what is called the *New Testament*. So far as the words *Old* and

[1] *In Act. hom.* xxxiii. § 4.

[2] *Prol. Gal.* [3] *Doctr. Chris.*, lib. ii, c. viii., 13.

[4] *Conc. Laodic., can.* lix.; *Conc.* vi. *Carth., can.* lvii.

[5] *Conc. Trid., Sessio* iv.

New are concerned, the distinction is obviously quite appropriate, since the one class preceded the other, not only in point of time, but by way of preparation. But why the word *Testament?* As one of several answers which might be given to the question, it may be observed that St. Paul, II. Cor. iii. 14, refers to the Scripture read by the Jews as the *palaia* (old) *diatheke*, thus implying that there was a *kaine* (new) *diatheke* possessed by the Christians. Now *diatheke*, though it is sometimes used in the Scripture to express a *compact* or *covenant*, primarily signifies a *testament* or *last will*, the sense attached to it in Heb. ix. 16, &c., and it has been very appropriately so translated in many passages by the author of that incomparable copy of the divine volume —the Latin Vulgate, for many centuries the only version in circulation throughout Western Christendom— where, for that reason, the expression *Old and New Testament* (Vetus et Novum Testamentum) came into general use; while its equivalent, *palaia kai kaine diatheke*, conveyed the same idea among the Christians of the East.

THE CATHOLIC CANON. The following catalogue exhibits the books which were pronounced canonical by the Council of Trent, in its Fourth Session, on April 8, 1546.

BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. Genesis,
2. Exodus,
3. Leviticus,
4. Numbers,
5. Deuteronomy,

(5 Books of Moses)

6. Josue,
7. Judges,
8. Ruth,
9. I. Kings,
10. II. Kings,
11. III. Kings,
12. IV. Kings,
13. I. Paralipomenon,
14. II. Paralipomenon,
15. I. Esdras,
16. II. Esdras, also entitled Nehemias,
17. Tobias,
18. Judith,
19. Esther,
20. Job,
21. Davidical Psalter of 150 Psalms,
22. Proverbs,
23. Ecclesiastes,
24. Canticle of Canticles,
25. Wisdom,
26. Ecclesiasticus,
27. Isaias,
28. Jeremias with Lamentations,
29. Baruch,
30. Ezechiel,
31. Daniel,
32. Ozee,
33. Joel,
34. Amos,
35. Abdias,
36. Jonas,
37. Micheas,
38. Nahum,
39. Habacuc,
40. Sophonias,
41. Aggæus,
42. Zacharias,
43. Malachias,

(Twelve Minor Prophets, so called merely because they wrote less than the others.)

44. I. Machabees,
45. II. Machabees.

Books of the New Testament.

1. Matthew,
2. Mark,
3. Luke,
4. John,

(The four Gospels according to)

5. Acts of the Apostles, written by Luke, the Evangelist,

6. Romans,
7. I. Corinthians,
8. II. Corinthians,
9. Galatians,
10. Ephesians,
11. Philippians,
12. Colossians,
13. I. Thessalonians,
14. II. Thessalonians,
15. I. Timothy,
16. II. Timothy,
17. Titus,
18. Philemon,
19. Hebrews,

(Fourteen Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the)

20. I. Peter,
21. II. Peter,
22. I. John,
23. II. John,
24. III. John,
25. James,
26. Jude,
27. Apocalypse.

Altogether, therefore, according to the manner in which the canonical books are enumerated in the Catholic Church, they amount to 72-45 of the Old Testament and 27 of the New.

Christians at an early period divided the Sacred Books into several classes, based on the character of their contents. At present they are generally classified as legal; historical; moral, sapiental or didactic; and prophetical. The five Books of Moses or the Pentateuch in the Old, and the four Gospels in the New Testament, are legal. Josue and the following books as far as Psalms, together with the two Books of Machabees, in the Old Testament, and the Acts of the Apostles in the New, are historical. The Psalms, Proverbs, and the other Books as far as Isaias in the Old Testament, and the Epistles in the New, are sapiental. Isaias and the other Prophets as far as Machabees in the Old, and the Apocalypse in the New Testament, are prophetical. The legal books are so called, because in those of Moses the Old Law is contained, and the New Law is set forth in the Gospels. The historical are so designated because they are a record of past events. The sapiental are thus styled, because they inculcate the highest wisdom by encouraging the practice of virtue and denouncing vice. The prophetical, as the name imports, are those in which future events are foretold.

These distinctions are recognized principally among Catholics, and are both judicious and appropriate.

Besides the strictly canonical books, there were in early times others, professedly religious, and written, some of them before, some of them after the commencement of the Christian era. Several of them have utterly disappeared, but the number still extant is quite considerable. The style, spirit, and contents of many among them are such, that their real character could be detected solely by the light of unerring tradition. Such clever attempts at fraud seem to have thrown a shade of suspicion even on some books, of whose divine origin probably no one would otherwise have entertained a doubt. As a safeguard, therefore, against error in a matter so important, for several centuries after the completion of the sacred volume, ecclesiastical writers often applied to all books professing to belong to it certain terms, which expressed the opinions they had formed regarding the character of these books. These terms do not in all cases, even when used by the same writer, convey the same meaning. Yet they enable the reader to perceive that the writers in question generally divided all books, the intrinsically as well as merely professedly sacred, into four classes. At least, such a division is suggested by their criticisms.

The first class consisted of those books whose canonicity all Christians, with the exception of a few obscure sectarists, always admitted. They comprised almost all on the preceding catalogue.

Second class. Those books, whose canonicity, though generally admitted, was either rejected or doubted by a few otherwise orthodox writers. They embraced all on the preceding catalogue which were not included in the first class.

Third class. Those books not found in the preceding catalogue, and which, though some of the early Fathers

cited them as Sacred Scripture, were even then and are now almost universally excluded from the canon.

Fourth-class. Those that were generally not only pronounced uncanonical, but stigmatized as absurd, heretical, or blasphemous.

Following are some of the words by which the early writers seem to indicate the class to which, as judged by their own statements, they appear to assign the books which they had occasion to mention. It need hardly be observed that in some instances the distinctions made are not very sharply drawn.

The books of the first class, besides being designated as shown above,[1] were said to be "*acknowledged by all*;[2] *incorporated or in the Testament*;[3] *not contradicted*;[4] *regular*;[5] *canonized*;[6] *of perfect authority*."[7]

Those of the second class were denominated "*not canonized*;[8] *not canonical*;[9] *controverted*;[10] *ecclesiastical*;[11] *apocryphal*;[12] *of middle authority*;[13] *pseudepigraphal*,"[14] (ascribed to the wrong author).

The books of the third are described as "*spurious*;[15] *to be repudiated*;[16] *apocryphal*;[17] *of no authority*."[18]

The books of the fourth class are denounced as "*apocryphal*;[19] *absurd and impious*;[20] *to be not only repudiated but condemned*;[21] *of no authority*."[22]

[1] P. 1. [2] Eusebius, *E. Hist.*, B. iii., c. 3.
[3] Ibidem. [4] Ibidem, vi., c. 13.
[5] Origen *on Matthew* xxvii. 9. transl. by Rufinus. [6] Athanasius, *Fest. Ep.*
[7] Junilius *de Part. D. Leg.*
[8] Athanasius, *Fest. Ep.* [9] Greg. the Great, *Mor.*, B. xix., c. xxi.
[10] Eusebius, *E. Hist.*, B. vi., c. 13,14; Athanas., Synopsis.
[11] Rufinus, *Expos. Symb.*
[12] Jerome, *Pref. to Dan.* [13] Junilius, *De Part. D. Leg.*
[14] Jerome, *Pref. to Books of Solomon.*
[15] Eusebius, *E. Hist.*, B. iii., c. 25.
[16] Innocent I., *Ep. Exuper.* [17] Jerome *Ep. to Læta.*
[18] Junilius, *de Part. D. Leg.*
[19] Origen, *Pref. to Canticles.* [20] Eusebius, *E. Hist.*, B. iii., c. 25.
[21] Innocent I., *Ep. to Exuper.* [22] Junilius, *de Part. D. Leg.*

It is thus seen that many of the terms employed by the Fathers (especially the word *apocryphal*), for the purpose of indicating the quality of the various books claiming to be parts of the Sacred Scripture, do not always convey the same idea, even when used by the same writers. The result has been that the belief of many of the Fathers regarding some books, either actually or only professedly pertaining to the divine volume, has been misunderstood by readers, who rushed at conclusions based on one or two isolated passages in their works, instead of patiently investigating the practice as well as the statements of the authors, and then pronouncing judgment. As an instance of this, the use that has been made of *apocryphal* may here be referred to. This word, though originally Greek, occurs but rarely in the Greek Scriptures; and when it is met with therein, it has the same sense which pagan Greek writers had attached to it. It is found in Mark iv. 22, and is there translated *secret;* in Luke viii. 17, where its English equivalent is *hidden*, and in Colossians ii. 3, being rendered *hid*, but in no case implying something worthless, objectionable, false, or spurious. Indeed, it does not seem to have been used for that purpose until the appearance of those fictitious Gospels, Epistles, Acts, Testaments, and other similar productions of primitive Christian times, when the word was applied to all such writings, but probably as much to express the obscurity of their origin as the too often objectionable character of their contents. Its application by writers to books which, though belonging to the Bible, were regarded by them with suspicion, or as unfit to be generally read, followed as a matter of course. And such works are known to have been even among those pertaining to the Hebrew Canon. For Origen, in his answer to Africanus, intimates that the Jews had "Hebrew apocryphal books;" and there is good reason for believing that

Canticles and Ecclesiastes, with portions of Genesis and Ezechiel, belonged to the number. In fact, Origen states that it was said, "That among the Hebrews no one before reaching the age of maturity was allowed even to hold this book (Canticles) in his hands;"[1] and St. Jerome[2] remarks, that "The Hebrews say, that this book (Ecclesiastes) . . . . . might seem worthy to disappear with the other lost books of Solomon;" besides, in his Epistle to Paulinus, he declares that "The begining and end of Ezechiel are involved in obscurities, and among the Hebrews these parts and the exordium of Genesis must not be read by a man under thirty."

But the early Christian Fathers generally applied *apocryphal* only to such writings as were spurious, falsified, or heretical.[3] And S. Jerome was the first to so designate all books supposed to belong to the Old Testament, but which he did not find in the Hebrew canon. No matter what their intrinsic merits, or the esteem in which they had been held among Christians, whatever is outside that canon "must be placed among the apocryphal," is his arbitrary ruling.[4] Yet, while so deciding, he is proved by his own words to have recognized various and important distinctions among the books which he thus stigmatized. For Judith, which, as he admits (since he so read), "the Council of Nice computed among the Sacred Scriptures," must have had for that reason with him an authority equal to that of any book in the Hebrew canon. And Tobias, with the other books implied by him as apocryphal in his *Prol. Gal.*, must have been in his opinion (because, to use his own words, "the Church reads them"[5]) far superior in authority to "the dreams," as he styles them,[6]

[1] *Prologue to Canticles.* c. xx. [2] *On Eccles.*, xii. 13, 14.

[3] Clem. of Alexand., *Strom.* L. iii., c. iv; S. Iren., *contra hær.* L. i. c. xx; Origen, *Prolog. to Cant.;* Tertull., *de anim.* c. ii. [4] *Prol. Gal.*

[5] *Pref. in Libr. Salomonis.* [6] *In Esd. et Neh. præf.*

of apocryphal III. & IV. Esdras, or the apocryphal book of Enoch.[1]

Ecclesiastical, as used by Rufinus, the first to distinguish in this way a certain class of professedly Scriptural compositions, meant such books as were used in the Church, though not, at least universally, recognized as canonical. He was familiar with the writings of Eusebius, had in fact translated his Ecclesiastical History. In that work he found that Eusebius had made some distinctions in the books of Scripture, calling one class *controverted,* to which no doubt Rufinus considered *ecclesiastical* equivalent, as that class was composed of books which, though read publicly as well as privately, were not generally received as canonical.

The other terms applied by the Fathers to the books which commonly passed as Scripture are so well understood as to require no explanation. But *canonical* and *canonized,* although the sense generally attached to the words has been already indicated, call for a few additional remarks. At present *canonical* or *canonized* books necessarily mean only such to which the title of *Scripture,* or sacred, holy, divine Scripture, is applicable. Among early Christians it was otherwise; with them *canonical* or *canonized* books by no means implied a fixed number of writings, to which alone the name of Scripture, sacred, holy, or divine Scripture, could be given. For there were, besides the *canonical* or *canonized* books, others, which were frequently, it might be said generally, called Scripture, even holy and divine Scripture. These early Christians, too, had a canon embracing generally all Old Testament books received as divine by the Jews, and all New Testament books, except certain epistles and the Apocalypse; but they also honored with the name of Scripture and divine Scripture these and several other books as parts of the Old and New Testa-

[1] Liber *de vir. illustr.* c. iv.

ment; of these others some were afterwards designated canonical, and the rest at last universally rejected as not belonging to the Scriptures, if they had ever been so regarded. Hence *canonical* or *canonized*, so far as that term applies to books, had a meaning in primitive Christian times very different from what that term has at present.

Consequently all the Christian Fathers who pronounced any book *canonical* did so, because they found it in the Hebrew canon and generally treated as canonical Scripture by the Church; while the only reason they had, in most instances, for declaring a book uncanonical was its absence from that canon, or certain doubts expressed regarding it by other writers. That such was the case is proved by the fact that many of the Fathers, whether giving a list of the sacred books, or expressing an opinion regarding the character of any particular book, exclude from the canon of the Old Testament all such books as were rejected by the Jews, though they had no hesitation on other occasions in citing several such books as sacred or divine Scripture. The absence, however, of any authentic decision on the subject by the Church sufficiently accounts for the contradiction between the theory and practice of the Fathers in question. That certain books of the Old Testament were canonical they were assured, because they all knew that these books were received as such, not only by the Jews but by the Church. Of other books included in their copies of the Old Testament some were in doubt, because, while aware they were not on the Jewish Canon, they were not certain that they had been approved by the Church. And though they knew that several books professing to belong to the New Testament were universally recognized as part of it, they were aware that there were others not so recognized. Of the latter, as well as those Old Testament books rejected by the Jews, some of the Fathers speak with hesitation, if they do not

positively exclude them from the Canon, when exhibiting a catalogue of the sacred writings; but they commonly refer to them as Scripture, or even sacred Scripture, when they have occasion to cite them; thus showing that, while they were not absolutely sure that the books in question were canonical, they chose to treat them as integral parts of the Word of God.

Books of the fourth class were never mentioned except to be condemned as absurd or pernicious. It was not so in the case of books belonging to the third class. These were always regarded at least as innocuous; a few of them were treated with a certain degree of respect, even called divine by some of the early Fathers. III. Esdras, for example, from about the beginning of the third century until far in the fifth, was cited as Scripture by a few writers,[1] who obtained great distinction by their learning or sanctity. The books of the second class were appealed to at all times as Scripture, by all those who had occasion to quote the sacred text, even by those from whose catalogues they were formally excluded, a fact of which, however remarkable, abundant evidence will be found in their writings. Soon after the first quarter of the fourth century Greek catalogues of the Sacred Books began to appear. But these catalogues are rarely identical. Some of them include one or more of the books of the second class among those of the first. Others exclude from the first class all those of the second, with the remark that they were not canonical, or that they were read in the Church, or that they were read to catechumens. In the last half of the same century similar efforts to catalogue the sacred books were made among the Latins, and with somewhat similar results, though with an increasing tendency to include in the divine volume all books per-

[1] Clement of Al., *Strom.* L. iii. c. xxi; S. Augustine, *Civ. Dei*, L. xviii. c. xxxvi. and others.

taining to the second class; all of which, however, in the East as well as the West, continued from the first to be generally quoted as Scripture, even by the very authors of those catalogues from which they had been formally excluded. This remarkable antagonism between the explicit declarations of a few writers and their belief as implied in their uniform practice ceased at last, so far as Catholics were concerned, when by the decree of the Council of Trent, in the sixteenth century, the books of the second class, no less than those of the first, were declared canonical. Soon after, to distinguish one from the other, those belonging to the first class were called protocanonical, the first in the canon, because they have been always received in and by the Church; and those of the second class were called deuterocanonical, second or next in the canon, because, though always received as Divine Scripture by the Church, they had not been always so received by some in the Church, a fact which rendered it necessary to pronounce them canonical at a time, of course, subsequent to that when the other books were received as canonical by the unanimous consent of all Christians. The division into protocanonical and deuterocanonical probably originated with Sixtus of Sienna, but has never been sanctioned in any way by the Church, she having always treated all books in the canon as divine, regardless of the order in which they had been officially placed thereon. Yet the distinction is generally made use of by Catholic writers who treat of the canon, as it facilitates the discussion of the subject. To some extent it is also recognized by Protestant writers, though by many of them the deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament, with several others once found in that part of the Bible, are designated *apocryphal*, and the deuterocanonical books of the New Testament are grouped under the name of *Antilegomena*, contradicted. In the present work *proto*

and *deutero*, for the sake of brevity, will be substituted hereafter for *protocanonical* and *deuterocanonical*.

Of the deutero books, some, as just remarked, are found in the Old Testament, and others in the New. Those belonging to the former are Tobias, Judith, Esther, [1] Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, First and Second Machabees, all of the third chapter of Daniel commencing with verse twenty-fourth and ending with verse ninetieth, that is, the Prayer of Azarias, the Song of the Three Children, and the two last chapters, xiii. and xiv., containing the history of Susanna and the story of Bel and the Dragon. The deutero books of the New Testament are the Epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews, the Epistle of St. James, the Epistle of St. Jude, the second Epistle of St. Peter, the second and third Epistle of St. John, the Apocalypse, together with the last twelve verses of St. Mark's Gospel, that part of the twenty-second Chapter in St. Luke's Gospel describing the bloody sweat of the Redeemer and the visit of the comforting angel, and that part of the eighth chapter in St. John's Gospel referring to the woman taken in adultery.

[1] Esther is here inserted among the deutero books, for the reason that, though most Catholic writers place it among the proto, several Fathers either considered it doubtful or excluded it from the canon. It is omitted in Melito's catalogue. is declared not canonical in the catalogues attributed to Athanasius, is doubted by Amphilochius, is overlooked in the catalogue of Gregory Nazianzen, is omitted by Leontius, is placed among the contradicted books by Nicephorus of Constantinople, and is said to be destitute of perfect authority by Junilius. Erasmus (*Explan. Symbolic Catech.* 4.), Sixtus of Sienna (*Bibliotheca Sancta* L. i. p. 14.), Bellarmine (*de verbo Dei*, L. i. c. 4.), Mellini (*Inst. Bible.*, p. 1. *diss.* i. c. iii.), and Dixon (*Gen. Introd.*, c. 1.) classify it with the deutero books. Several Protestant writers have denied its canonicity ; so it has been said by Whiston, who, while treating of Esther as contained in the Protestant Bible, observes himself that "no religious Jew could well be the author of it." (Note on Jos. Antiq. B. xi., c. 6, § 13.) It is therefore not easy to see why, when Judith, for example, is placed among the deutero, Esther should be classified with the proto books, especially as the latter was at one time not included in their canon by the Jews.

CHAPTER II.

The Jewish Canon.

The Jews exclude from their canon not only all books of the New Testament, but all the deutero of the old, except the nine first chapters, and the three first verses of the tenth chapter, of Esther. The number of books on their canon is really thirty-nine. But, by arbitrarily reckoning in several instances as one, two or more books distinguished by different titles, and written by different authors, they have reduced these thirty-nine to a much less number. Josephus, the Jewish historian, who wrote about the close of the first century, is the first to say that the Hebrew Scriptures consisted of twenty-two Books.[1] And St. Jerome[2] remarks that the reason of arranging the whole collection in this way was, that the number of books might correspond to the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet, which was twenty-two. It may have been for the same reason that the Greeks divided their Iliad and Odyssey into twenty-four books each, that being the number of characters in the Greek alphabet. As arranged on this principle, the Hebrew Scriptures are enumerated in the following order, each book being preceded from first to last not only by its proper number, but

[1] "I. *Contra Apion.*" § 8.

[2] "*Prologus Galeatus.*"

by its proper letter, which letter, however, is here omitted :—

1.	Berescith,	that is, Genesis	12.	Iehhezkiel,	that is, Ezechiel.
2.	Veele Scemoth,	" Exodus.	13.	There-Asar,	" 12 Minor Prophets
3.	Vajikra,	" Leviticus.	14.	Sepher Tehillim,	" Book of Psalms
4.	Vaiedabher,	" Numbers.	15.	Misle,	" Proverbs of Solomon.
5.	Elle haddevarim,	" Deuteronomy.	16.	Job,	" Job.
6.	Jeosciua,	" Josue.	17.	Daniel,	" Daniel.
7.	Sciophetim ve Ruth,	" Judges and Ruth.	18.	Ezra,	" Esdras I. & II.
8.	Scemuel I. & II.	" Kings I. & II.	19.	Divre hajamin	" Paralipomenon.
9.	Melachim I. & II.	" Kings III. & IV.	20.	Esther,	" Esther.
10.	Iesciajahu,	" Isaias.	21.	Koheleth,	" Ecclesiastes.
11.	Iirmijahu vekinoth.	" Jeremias with Lamentations.	22.	Scir hascirim,	" Canticle of Canticles.

In this list, each of the first five names is simply the first words of the book which it indicates. The remaining names are either those of the respective authors, or such as denote the persons or subjects treated in the corresponding books. *Kinoth* means Lamentations, the book being sometimes called by the Jews *Echa* (How), which is the first word. *There-Asar* means the number twelve. *Divre hajamin*—words of days—*a diary* or *journal*, rendered by Latins as well as Greeks *Paralipomena—things omitted*, and by the English Protestant translators *Chronicles*. The meaning of the other names on the list is sufficiently indicated by the corresponding words in the English list.

A second enumeration, also noticed by St. Jerome,[1] and followed by some of the Talmudic doctors, increases the number of books to twenty-four, the letter *yod*

[1] "*Prolog. Gal.*"

being written three times instead of once, as in the former case. This enumeration separates Ruth from Judges, inserting it after Esther; and Lamentations from Jeremias, assigning to the former the last place on the list. With these exceptions it was the same as the first, and was adopted by many Greeks, as the number of books was thus made to agree with the number of letters in their alphabet. This enumeration was also favorably regarded by some Latin writers, as they recognized in it a mystical allusion to the four and twenty elders of the Apocalypse.

There is still a third enumeration, which is followed among some of the more modern Jews, and augments the number of Books to twenty-seven, by adding what grammarians call the five finial letters to the twenty-two of which the Hebrew alphabet consists. Hence results an arrangement by which Ruth is detached from Judges. Four distinct Books of Kings and two separate Books of Paralipomenon are thus obtained, together with another by dividing into two books Esdras and Nehemias. In this enumeration Judges is followed by Ruth; then we have Kings I., II., III., IV., followed by Paralipomenon I. and II., after which the order is Esdras, Nehemias, Esther, Job, Psalter, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticle of Canticles, Isaias, Jeremias with Lamentations, Ezechiel, Daniel, the Prophets.

The, Jews like the Christians, classify their Sacred Books, but in a manner which seems vague as well as arbitrary. The first intimation of any classification whatever among them is met with in the Prologue to the Book of Ecclesiasticus, where reference is made to the *Law*, the *Prophets*, and *other Books*. This was about two hundred and forty-five years before Christ. The frequent allusions to the *Law* and the *Prophets* in the New Testament imply, at least, that a distinction was made

between the Books of Moses (for these were called the Law) and those of subsequent writers. And the words of Our Lord as recorded in Luke xxiv. 44, where he mentions distinctly the *Law*, the *Prophets*, and the *Psalms*, prove that in His time a triple classification, identical with that mentioned in the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, was recognized among the Jews; for, evidently, by the *Psalms* Our Lord means those portions of the canon which the grandson of the author of Ecclesiasticus included in the *other Books*. A similar classification of the Sacred Books was still made in the time of Josephus, the historian. For, after stating that the Jews had twenty-two Books, he adds that, "of them five belong to Moses .... the Prophets, who were after Moses, wrote down what was done in their own times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of life." [1] The Jews, therefore, in the time of Josephus, and at least for three centuries before that, divided the Books of their canon into three classes: first, the *Law*, or Books of Moses; second the *Prophets*; third the *Psalms* or *Hymns*, which comprise the *other Books*, or all not in the other two classes. St. Jerome, who wrote three or four centuries after Josephus, testifies that in his time the Jews classified their books in the same manner, for he observes that they called the five Books of Moses *Thora*, the Law; eight others were composed of *Prophets*, and the remaining nine constituted the *Hagiographa*—sacred writings. [2] It is to be observed, however, that, as the word *Prophet* among the Jews might mean not only one endowed with the strictly prophetical spirit, but one, who, even writing as a historian, was guided by divine assistance, the number of books in the second class was variable, a fact which rendered the number in the third variable also, since the number belonging to the first

[1] "I. *Contra Apion.*" § 8. [2] "*Prolog.*" *Gal.*"

was always the same. Hence, though in the time of Josephus the books written by prophets amounted to thirteen, and the hymns to but four, the former, when St. Jerome wrote, numbered only eight, while the latter, corresponding to the Hagiographa, were represented by nine. Modern Jews generally divide the Books thus: First, *Thora*, the Law or five Books of Moses. Second, *Neviim*—the Prophets earlier and later. Third, *Chetuvim*—writings (sacred), rendered Hagiographa by the Greeks. But so far as is known, the following classifications are all that have been made of their books by the Jews.

EARLIEST CLASSIFICATION.

5 Books of the Law.	13 Books by the Prophets.	The other Books: 4 of Hymns.
1. Genesis,	1. Josue,	1. Psalms of David,
2. Exodus,	2. Judges and Ruth,	2. Proverbs,
3. Leviticus,	3. Samuel,	3. Ecclesiastes,
4. Numbers,	4. Kings,	4. Canticle of Canticles.
5. Deuteronomy.	5. Paralipomenon,	
	6. Esdras,	
	7. Esther,	
	8. Job,	
	9. Isaias,	
	10. Jeremias and Lamentations,	
	11. Ezechiel,	
	12. Daniel,	
	13. xii Minor Prophets.	

This is supposed to be the most ancient classification, and the one referred to in the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, the New Testament, and Josephus. That some books were transferred subsequently from the second to the third class, thus causing a different distribution, is evident from the catalogue given by St. Jerome in his Prol. Gal., and in which is found this—

SECOND OR LATER CLASSIFICATION.

Thora: 5 Books	Nevim: 8 Books.	Chetuvim: 9 Books.
1. Genesis,	1. Josue,	1. Job,
2. Exodus,	2. Judges and Ruth,	2. Psalms,
3. Leviticus,	3. Samuel,	3. Proverbs,
4. Numbers,	4. Melachim,	4. Ecclesiastes,
5. Deuteronomy.	5. Isaias,	5. Canticle of Canticles.
	6. Jeremias with Lamentations,	6. Daniel,
	7. Ezechiel,	7. Paralipomenon,
	8. xii Minor Prephets,	8. I. & II. Esdras,
		9. Esther.

This classification is known to have been used as early as the fourth century after Christ, and to have been followed for two or three centuries afterwards. Like the first, it divided the Hebrew Scriptures into twenty-two Books, but it was adopted even by those who reckoned the number of books at twenty-four, and who reached that result by detaching Ruth from Judges and Lamentations from Jeremias, and placing them at the end of the Hagiographa, which was thus increased to eleven. From the preceding classification it appears that Daniel in the course of time was transferred from the Prophets to the Hagiographa, for the very questionable reason that he was by profession not a prophet but a courtier.

THIRD CLASSIFICATION.

The Law: 5 books.	The Prophets: 8 books.	Hagiographa: 11 books.
1. Genesis,	6. Josue,	14. Psalms,
2. Exodus,	7. Judges,	15. Proverbs,
3. Leviticus,	8. Samuel,	16. Job,
4. Numbers,	9. Melachim,	17. Canticle of Canticles,
5. Deuteronomy.	10 Isaias,	18. Ruth,
	11. Jeremias,	19. Lamentations,
	12. Ezechiel,	20. Ecclesiastes,
	13. xii Minor Prophets.	21. Esther,
		22. Daniel,
		23. Esdras and Nehemias,
		24. Paralipomenon.

This classification is now very generally followed by the Jews, and is found in all the Hebrew editions of the Bible. In many of these editions twenty-seven distinct books are enumerated, a result that is attained by dividing Samuel and Melachim each into two books, and separating Nehemias from Esdras. This much regarding the manner in which the Books in the Hebrew canon are divided and classified.

With regard to the origin and antiquity of their canon the Jews themselves entertain no doubt, though their belief on either point has not met with general acceptance. This much, however, is certain, that Cyrus, king of Persia, by a public edict permitted such of the captive Jews as wished to avail themselves of the privilege to return to their own country and rebuild their temple. A vast multitude of them, therefore, assembled together, and under the conduct of Zorobabel arrived at Jerusalem, 536 B. C., and commenced to restore divine worship. Hardly, however, had they laid the foundations of the temple, when they were compelled to desist from the undertaking by the opposition of their enemies, the Samaritans; and it was not until 515 B. C. that the building was completed. Through the influence which he possessed at the Persian Court, Esdras, who is described as a "Priest—a ready scribe in the law of Moses, instructed in the words and commandments of the Lord and His ceremonies in Israel,"[1] obtained permission from Artaxerxes Longimanus, 457 B. C., to lead back another colony of his countrymen to their native land, and there, in the name of the king of Persia, assume control in all matters, civil as well as ecclesiastical. Ten years afterwards Nehemias, another distinguished Jewish exile, was commissioned by the same monarch to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem. In the performance of this task he exhibited great energy and tact, and along with Esdras,

[1] Esdras vii. 6,–11.

whose confidence and co-operation he enjoyed, labored to improve the condition of the people and to restore respect for the laws of Moses.

After the walls had been rebuilt, the people came together and requested Esdras to read for them "the book of the law of Moses."[1] And he continued to do so during the Feast of Tabernacles, which they celebrated at that time. There were present on that occasion, along with Nehemias and others, Aggeus, Zacharias, and at a later period Malachias, who all rendered considerable assistance to Esdras and Nehemias in re-establishing the Jewish commonwealth. All that is here stated is derived from information supplied by the writings of Esdras and Nehemias, II. Paralipomenon, and the prophecies of Aggæus and Zacharias. Day by day, during the seven days that the feast lasted, Esdras read and interpreted the words of the Law to the people.[2] So far as can be inferred from the testimony of the sacred record itself, Esdras neither then, nor at any other time, had anything more to do with the Scriptures than what is implied by reading and explaining them. The universal belief of the Jews, however, attributes to him a work far more important than that with which he is credited in the inspired narrative. For they allege that when sent to Jerusalem he there not only read and interpreted the Book of the Law to the people, but exerted all his energies in collecting, correcting, and arranging the sacred writings, so as to form them into one authoritative record or canon of Scripture, which, being then submitted by him to the judgment of the great Sanhedrim or Council, was by that body confirmed and declared closed; so that nothing afterwards could be taken therefrom, or ever again be added thereto. Divested of many highly improbable details, which will be noticed presently, such is the account which the

[1] Nehemias viii. 1.

[2] Ibid. ix. 18.

Jews give of the manner and occasion in which their canon was settled.

Probably the earliest reference to the connection of Esdras with the formation of the Hebrew canon occurs in the fourteenth chapter of the apocryphal book IV. Esdras, written according to most critics in the first or second century after Christ, but most probably by a Jew in the first century, and soon after retouched by a Christian. It professes to have been written by Esdras, the scribe and author of I. Esdras, to whom the Jews ascribe the formation of their canon. The writer says, he was favored with a visitation from the Lord, in answer to whom he promises that he will go and rebuke the people; "but" asks "who shall admonish those who are born in the meantime; therefore is the world placed in darkness, and those who live in it without light. For Thy law has been burned, wherefore no one knows what has been done by Thee, or what works shall commence. For, if I have found favor with Thee, instil into me Thy holy spirit; and I will write all that has been done in the world from the beginning; what was written as Thy law, that men may be able to find the way, and those who wish to live in the latter end may live." Then he is directed to assemble the people, and tell them that they should not look for him for forty days. He is also told to prepare many tablets, and to take with him "Sareas, Dabrias, Salemias, Echanus, and Asiel, these five, who could write rapidly. "And come hither," saith the Lord, "and I will enkindle in your heart the lamp of understanding, which will not be extinguished until what you commence to write shall be finished. And then, all being completed, some thou shalt publish, some thou shalt deliver secretly to wise men, for to-morrow at this hour thou shalt commence to write." So the people are called together and exhorted by Esdras; then he tells them not to come or ask for

him for forty days. And he took with him the five men, and with them withdrew into a plain or field (campus). There he is presented with "a cup full as it were of water, but in color similar to fire." This he drank, and as he did so "his heart was tormented with understanding, and his breast increased by wisdom. For his spirit was preserved by memory. And his mouth was opened, and no more shut. The Most High gave understanding to the five men, and the ecstasies of the night that were spoken they wrote, but knew not, but at night they ate bread." "But I," says Esdras, "spoke by day, and at night was not silent." And during the forty days there were written 204 books. "And it came to pass, when the forty days were accomplished, the Most High spoke, saying: the first that thou hast written give to the public, that the worthy and unworthy may read. But the last seventy thou shalt keep, that thou mayest deliver them to the wise men of the people. For in them is a vein of knowledge, and a fount of wisdom, and a river of knowledge. And I did so."

Although it was certain that there was extant about the close of the second century a Greek copy of IV. Esdras, for it was quoted even as the work of "Esdras the Prophet" by Clement of Alexandria,[1] it was not known until the eighteenth century that there still existed any copy except that which was preserved in the Latin Vulgate of the Bible, and is the source whence the preceding statement has been derived. Since then, however, Arabic, Syriac, Ethiopic, and Armenian copies of the book have been found, yet differing considerably from the Latin version. To enter into a discussion about the age or origin of the book would be out of place here, especially as it could lead to no certain conclusion; and it need only be remarked that, while most critics suppose it to have been written at some early date within the

[1] *Strom.* iii. c. xvi.

Christian period, a few are of opinion that it was originally composed in Hebrew or Chaldee, even before the commencement of the Christian era. But all are agreed that the original, whatever that was, has been better preserved in the oriental copies than in the one with which Western Christians have been familiar; and that, at least, in the Ethiopic version there are not those evidences of Christian authorship, which appear in the Latin. Now, should any one conclude, after reading the book through, that there is much in it with a strong rabbinical flavor, he will be further confirmed in that belief, when informed that according to all the oriental copies (the Ethiopic alone admitting variations in the figures) the number of books written during the forty days was not 204, but 94. Then let him remember, that of the whole number written, 70 were to be reserved for private use, leaving for publication just 24, a number expressly stated in the Syriac and Arabic, but omitted in the Ethiopic and Armenian as well as the Latin; and that 24 is often the number of books found in the Hebrew canon: or let him suppose that 70 here stands for 72, just as lxx universally indicates the 72 translators of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek; then let him deduct this from the whole number said to have been written by Pseudo Esdras, and he will have the famous 22 of the rabbinical doctors. At least he will then have some reason for believing, that he has found in IV. Esdras the earliest written account of the attempt made by the Jews to attribute to Esdras the Scribe the honor of restoring the lost contents of the Old Testament, and of closing the canon of Scripture.

What degree of credit was given to this account among the primitive Christians, it were hard to say; nor is it certain that a similar tradition was cherished among contemporary Jews, although several grave considerations leave scarcely any reason to doubt it. The

author of IV. Esdras unmistakably betrays his Jewish extraction; and it can hardly be supposed that he wrote otherwise than his coreligionists believed at the time. Esdras the Scribe is still believed by the Jews to have played by far the most important part in making their canon what it is. Exaggerated, if not fabulous, statements in reference to the affair have been put forth by Jewish writers, as the sequel will show. And it cannot be doubted that they are responsible for many of the incredible details, which render the account of the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek quite preposterous. In fact, the writer of that account, Aristeas, judged by his own statements, was himself a Jew. There is therefore strong presumptive evidence for insisting, not only that IV. Esdras was written by a Jew, but that the book expressed the belief held by the Jews at the time regarding the manner in which their canon had been formed.

But whether they were influenced by the account of Pseudo Esdras, or a similar tradition prevailing among the Jews at the time, it is certain that some of the early Christian Fathers believed that at the end of the Babylonian captivity the Hebrew Scriptures, if they had not utterly disappeared, were seriously mutilated or corrupted, and that Esdras the Scribe restored them to their former condition. As quoted by Eusebius, Irenæus, who lived in the second century, states, "that God . . . . in the captivity of the people under Nabuchodonosor, when the Scriptures had been corrupted, and the Jews were returning to their own country after seventy years, subsequently, in the time of Artaxerxes, King of the Persians, inspired Esdras, a priest of the tribe of Levi, to set in order again all the discourses of the preceding Prophets, and restore complete to the people the legislation by Moses."[1] Clement of Alexan-

[1] "*Eccl. Hist.*," lib. v., c. viii.

dria, who wrote about the end of the same century, asserts,[1] "that when in the captivity of Nabuchodonosor the Scriptures were corrupted, in the time of Artaxerxes, King of the Persians, Esdras the Levite, who was a priest, being inspired, forthwith prophetically restored all the ancient Scriptures." Tertullian,[2] who lived within the following century, declares that "when Jerusalem was destroyed by the Babylonians, it is certain that the entire instrument of Jewish literature was restored by Esdras." In the Athanasian Synopsis it is said that "this is also related of Esdras, when the books had perished through the negligence of the people and the long captivity, he being an industrious and well disposed man, and a reader, kept them all in his possession, and at last brought them forth, and delivered them to all, and thus preserved them." And referring to the Psalms, the author of the Synopsis further observes that "Esdras formed into one book all these Psalms by whomsoever written." St. John Chrysostom,[3] who died in 407, says, that in the calamities which befell the Jews "the records were burnt; but God again inspired another admirable man, I mean Esdras, to publish them, and caused them to be composed out of what were left." Even St. Jerome[4] who died a few years later, was not unwilling that Esdras should be called "the restorer of the Pentateuch." Whether more is meant by this than what is implied in the Saint's statements, that Esdras "invented other (Hebrew) letters, which we now use,[5] is uncertain. In the same century Theodoret[6] wrote thus: "For, when the Scriptures partly under Manasses . . . . . were burned, partly in the time of the captivity . . . . . utterly perished, the blessed Esdras, a man excelling in virtue, and, as the affair itself declares, filled

[1] "*Strom.*," lib. i., c. xxii.
[2] "*De cult. Fœm.*," lib i., c.iii.
[3] *Hom. viii. in Ep. ad Hebr.*
[4] "*Adv. Helvid.*" § 7.
"*Prol. Gal.*"
[5] "*Explan. in Cant.*," *Præf.*

by the Holy Ghost, wrote out for us the necessary and salubrious Scriptures, not only the books of Moses, but Josue also. If, therefore, Esdras composed them, transcribing not another copy, but filled by the Holy Ghost, how could it happen that this book should contain that argument which you affirm?" Leontius of Byzantium, who belonged to the sixth century, has this account of the matter: "Esdras, when he came to Jerusalem, and found that all the books were burned when they were carried into captivity, is said to have composed from memory the 22 books, which we have enumerated above."[1] In the following century St. Isidore of Seville wrote, that "after the Law had been burned by the Chaldeans, Esdras the Scribe, when the Jews returned to Jerusalem, being inspired by the divine Spirit, repaired the library of the Old Testament, and corrected all the volumes of the Law and the Prophets, which had been corrupted by the Gentiles, and divided the Old Testament into 22 books, that there might be as many books in the Law as there were letters."[2]

All these statements put together go to show that from the second to the seventh century it was the belief, at least of some among the most learned Christian writers belonging to that period, that, by reason of the calamities through which the Jews had passed, it was found that on their return from the captivity of Babylon not only was the integrity of the Old Testament, so far as it had been completed, seriously affected, but its contents were mutilated, corrupted, burned—in fact, irrecoverably lost; but that Esdras the Scribe, by divine assistance, was enabled to restore them to their former condition. A story that is thus traced back to almost the first century, and in the fabrication of which a Christian could have had no interest, must have had a Jewish origin, though when and by whom the story was started it may be impossible

[1] "*De Sectis.*" *Actio* ii. §. viii. [2] "*Etymol.*," L. vi, c. iii.

to say. Of the several writers who have reproduced it in one form or another,—and almost all of them have been cited above,—there is but one, St. Basil, of the fourth century, who evidently told it with IV. Esdras before him. "Here," says he, while referring to the Holy Land in his epistle to Chilo, "is the *plain* in which Esdras, after retiring from the rest, by the command of God belched forth all the divinely inspired books." But whether the belief of the other writers, who testify to the miraculous restoration of the Jewish Scriptures by Esdras the Scribe, was based on the account of Esdras IV., or on a similar fable originating with the Jews and adopted by the early Christians, but the record of which is no longer preserved among the former, that belief must be discarded as utterly unfounded. For it is certain, that on the occasion of the Babylonian captivity all existing copies of the Hebrew Scriptures were not destroyed. It was other treasures than those stowed away in Hebrew libraries that the conquerors coveted. At least there is no intimation in the inspired account of the captivity, that the captives were despoiled of their sacred literature, or were prevented from carrying the rolls that contained it to their new homes. On the contrary, it is clearly implied that, whatever may have been the carelessness of the Jews about the preservation of their Scriptures, or the efforts of their enemies for the destruction of those Scriptures, some of the exiles not only preserved copies of these precious records, but must have devoted much time to the study of their contents. Daniel must have had such a copy, for he refers not only to the prophecy of Jeremias, but to "the maledictions and the curse, which is written in the Book of Moses."[1] Besides, for 57 years before the time when Esdras, according to the story, restored the Scriptures, the Priests and Levites were performing their respective

[1] Dan. ix. 2–11.

functions in the new temple at Jerusalem, "as it is written in the Book of Moses."[1] But how could they do so unless they had the book? And if the story be true, how is it that Esdras, even while at Babylon, was known to be "a ready scribe in the law of Moses."[2] Even the very passage[3] on the sole strength of which it is possible to argue that Esdras restored all the books of the Scripture when no longer in existence, exposes the absurdity of that supposition, for there the people are said to have asked "Esdras the Scribe to bring the Book of the Law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel," words which prove that the book was still well known to the people themselves, or at least that they knew it was then extant. It is certain also that Tobias, who was not a priest, nor a scribe, nor a Levite, but a simple captive belonging to the tribe of Nephthali, was familiar with the writings of the prophets.[4] If therefore, notwithstanding all reasonable presumption to the contrary, the positive order of Moses regarding the constant study of the law by the Hebrew rulers,[5] and the reading of it every seven years by the priests to the people,[6] had been all along disregarded; and though it were not on record that at least on one occasion the princes and Levites went forth with the Book of the Law of the Lord to instruct the people in all the cities of Judea,[7] yet there is evidence sufficient in the Esdrine and other canonical books belonging to the same period to place it beyond all doubt, that at the time of the captivity the Sacred Scriptures still survived, that the people were by no means ignorant of their contents and therefore that the supposition that Esdras, whether assisted by God or not, dictated them all from memory, after they had utterly perished, is wholly false and unwar-

[1] Esdras vi. 18. [2] Ibid. vii. 6.
[3] Neh. viii. 1—8. [4] Tob. ii. 6; xiv. 6.
[5] Deut. xvii. 19. [6] Ibid. xxxi. 10, 11. [7] II. Paral. xvii. 7-9.

ranted. Finally, how, it may be asked, was it possible for Cyrus, King of Persia, to have obtained a copy of the prophecy of Isaias, as Josephus[1] has stated, if the Sacred Scriptures had entirely disappeared? This single fact would of itself effectually disprove the supposition in question.

[1] "*Antiq.*," lib. xi., c. 1., § 2.

CHAPTER III.

Belief of the Jews regarding the Origin of their Canon.

The Jews, in ascribing the formation of their canon to Esdras, appeal to a tradition based on certain statements in their Talmud (Doctrine). This work consists of two parts, one called the Mishna (repetition), the other the Gemara (completion or supplement). The Mishna contains the oral law; for the Jews believe, without however the slightest authority from the Scripture, that besides the written law Moses also received at the same time on Mount Sinai an oral or unwritten law, which was the interpretation of the written law, and constitutes the text of the Talmud. This interpretation was intrusted by Moses to Josue, who in turn consigned it to the seventy elders, from whom it was received by the prophets, who transmitted it to the members of the Sanhedrim or Great Synagogue, from whom it passed into the custody of the Rabbins, who, on the final dispersion of the Jews, as it was no longer possible to preserve it by oral tradition, committed it to writing, lest it might be irretrievably lost. The Gemara consists of a series of commentaries on the Mishna by several Rabbins, who wrote, some in Judea, some in Babylon. The commentaries by the former constitute what is called the Jerusalem Gemara; those by the latter belong to what is known as the Babylonian Gemara. There are therefore two Talmuds, the Jeru-

salem and the Babylonian, having the same Mishna or text, but different Gemaras or commentaries. The Jerusalem Talmud was completed about the third century of our era; the other not until a later period. The entire work extends over twelve folio volumes, and is regarded by the Jews as an authoritative exposition of their religious belief and practice. Indeed, in contrasting it with the law written in the Pentateuch, they attach a far higher value to the former, although there is nothing in their canonical Scriptures, or in human history, to justify what is said of its origin or preservation; while at the same time it abounds in statements derogatory to the majesty of God, narratives remarkable for their absurdity, and questions as profane and impious as they are puerile and ludicrous. Whether the Talmud be an outgrowth of the fable contained in IV. Esdras may never be determined; but the written and unwritten law, the idea which serves as the basis of the former work, must remind the reader of the distinctions made by Pseudo Esdras between the books which he wrote, some being for general use, others for the benefit of a special class.

The tradition which ascribes to Esdras the credit of having drawn up a canon is traced to a statement in one of the oldest tracts of the Talmud, *the Pirke Aboth* (chapter of Fathers), which refers to the Jewish Fathers, who are supposed to have handed down the oral law, and in which it is said: "Moses received the law from Mount Sinai, and delivered it to Josue, Josue to the elders, the elders to the prophets, and the prophets delivered it to the men of the Great Synagogue. These last spake these words: 'Be cautious in pronouncing judgment; make many disciples; put a hedge about the law.'" If these last words refer to the entire body of Scripture, they would seem to indicate a closing of the canon, though when or where is not stated. The

same statement is repeated with more minuteness in another tract, belonging to the Babylonian Gemara, and entitled *Baba Bathra* (last gate). There the statement takes this form: "Who wrote the sacred books? Moses wrote his own book, and the section of Balaam and Job; Josue wrote his own book and eight verses in the law; David wrote the book of Psalms by the ten elders, by Adam first, by Melchisedech, by Abraham, by Moses, by Heman, by Iduthun, by Asaph, by the three children of Kore; Jeremias wrote his own book, the Book of Kings, and Lamentations; Ezechiel and his college wrote Isaias, Proverbs, Canticles, and Ecclesiastes; the men of the Great Synagogue wrote Ezechiel, the twelve prophets, David, and the book of Esther; Esdras wrote his own book, and brought the genealogies of Paralipomenon down to his own times. And this is confirmed by the word of a master; for Rab Juda says that he heard from a Master that Esdras did not go up from Babylon before he brought the genealogies down to his own age, but that he then went up. Who finished them (the genealogies)? Nehemias, the son of Helcias."

If the word *wrote*, wherever it occurs in the preceding extract, be taken to express the act on account of which one is considered not a copyist or compiler, but the author of a book, many of the statements made therein are simply incredible. But as the Hebrew word, which has been rendered *wrote*, may in the opinion of Hebrew scholars mean what is done in arranging, transcribing, or editing what has already been written by another, it will then be possible to explain the extract in such a way that, even if it be not a record of actual facts, what it states may be accepted as not absolutely improbable. Even so, however, it is difficult to discern therein any reference to a canon of Scripture, or an authoritative collection of sacred books by Esdras or any one else.

He, like several others, is represented, as a writer, copyist, compiler, or commentator; and Nehemias, not Esdras, is mentioned as the last who had anything to do with the Hebrew Scriptures; for the genealogies, which he is said to have "finished," have been brought down to the latest date contained in those Scriptures. Every name mentioned in the extract is that of a writer or compiler of some particular book or books; but not one among them is said to have written, compiled, edited, or collected together all the books referred to, so that, so far as the Talmud is concerned, there is no reason to believe that Esdras drew up or took any part in drawing up a canon of Scripture.

It would appear that, on the strength of the Talmud's testimony alone, some rabbinical scholars, Elias Levita, of the sixteenth century, and others who flourished subsequently to the completion of the Talmud, assert that Esdras had around him a college of 120 eminent scholars for the purpose of assisting him in collecting and arranging the sacred books. Among the members were Daniel the prophet with his three companions Misac, Sidrac, and Abdenago, Aggæus, Zacharias, Simon the Just, and Esdras himself, who, according to a rabbinical opinion, was the same with the Prophet Malachias, and the first president of the college, as Simon the Just was the last. This college was in fact the Great Synagogue or Sanhedrim, so it is said; and it is further stated that all its members were living at the same time, under the reign of Darius Hystaspes, King of Persia, identical, as the Rabbins think, with Darius Codomanus, whom Alexander the Great subdued, and also with Artaxerxes, who sent Esdras and Nehemias to Jerusalem. These Jewish doctors furthermore maintain that Simon the Just was that Jeddoa the High Priest, sometimes written Jadus or Jaddua, who, according to Josephus,[1] met and escorted

[1] *Antiq.*, B. xi., c. viii., § 5.

Alexander the Great into Jerusalem.[1] Now, whatever may be said of the relation between Esdras and the Hebrew canon, these and similar statements may be ranked among the collection of fables contained in the Talmud and the works of rabbinical writers. For if these statements were entitled to belief, it would follow that the Persian empire lasted only 52 years instead of 209;[2] that Daniel must have lived considerably more than 250 years; that Simon the Just, after becoming a member of the Great Synagogue about 453 B. C., when he was at least thirty years of age, lived until 292 B. C., thus dying at the age of 191. To maintain that the first year of the reign of Cyrus was separated from the last in that of Darius Codomanus by only 52 years; that Esdras, Daniel, Misac, Sidrac, Abdenago, Aggæus, Zacharias, and Simon the Just were all contemporary with the return from Babylon, and survived until the time of Alexander the Great; that Simon the Just even outlived Alexander by 32 years, for the latter died 324 B. C., whereas the death of the former, according to rabbinical chronology, occurred in 292 B. C.—to maintain all these points which are either contained in, or follow from the statements of many rabbinical writers, is, it may well be said, to disregard not only the teaching of human experience, but the concurrent testimony of sacred and profane history. Furthermore, the substance of the rabbinical tradition is that Esdras is the author of the canon, he having revised, arranged, and determined the books of which it is composed, with or without the sanction of the Great Synagogue. Yet that this was not the case is directly implied by the same tradition, for, according to it, Simon the Just completed the canon by adding thereto the books of Esdras and Nehemias. Attempts have been made to account for the contradic-

[1] Prideaux, *Connexion*, Part I., B. iv. v., pp. 193, 265.

[2] Ibid., Part I. B. viii., p. 380.

tions, and explain away the glaring anachronisms embodied in the tradition current among rabbinical doctors, regarding the canon of Scripture. But these attempts are generally regarded as unsatisfactory, and will convince few who are guided to their own conclusions by common sense and the testimony of the Scriptures, instead of the fabulous statements advanced by the admirers of the Talmud.

No less incredible are the statements of rabbinical writers regarding the origin, authority, and functions of the Great Synagogue, to which they refer in the account which they give of Esdras. This Synagogue, which is said to have constituted the supreme tribunal among the Jews, is called by the Rabbins the *Sanhedrim*, or more correctly the *Sanhedrin*, a modification of the Greek *Sunedrion* (a council), which seems to imply that the Great *Synagogue* (another word of Greek extraction) was not established, until the successors of Alexander the Great had acquired a controlling influence in Judea. Rabbinical writers have tortured their imagination by futile efforts to enhance the credit and importance of this court, which was composed of "Priests, Levites, and Israelites whose rank entitled them to associate with Priests."[1] They numbered 70, some say 72, members besides the High Priest, "provided he was a man endowed with wisdom."[2] Ordinarily the office of president was filled by him. They further assert that the Sanhedrim was instituted by Moses, when, as directed by God, he selected 70 men to assist him in bearing *the burden of the people*;[3] and that it maintained an uninterrupted existence from that time until long after the commencement of the Christian era, having survived all the calamities in which the Jews were involved, and even their final dispersion as a nation under the Emperor Hadrian. It is also stated that the authority possessed

[1] Maimonides, "*Sanhed.*," c. 2. [2] Ibid. [3] Num. xi. 16, 17.

by the Sanhedrim was no less respectable than its origin and duration, being co-extensive with the civil and ecclesiastical relations of the people. Thus it received appeals from all other tribunals, interpreted the law, ordained sacred rites, imposed tribute, declared war, exercised the power of life and death, could call the High Priest to account, and even scourge the King when in fault. In fine, it exercised supreme legislative, executive, and judicial authority. Now all this is undiluted fiction, in support of which not a single text can be produced from the Scriptures, nor a word cited from any respectable profane writer. It is true that, as Moses, at the suggestion of Jethro, appointed men as rulers over thousands, and hundreds, and fifties, and tens, to decide controversies among the people,[1] he also, when instructed by God to do so, collected together 70 men of the ancients of Israel, who, it seems, were to assist him in all matters pertaining to religion.[2] Furthermore, he directed that after the conquest of Canaan judges and magistrates should be appointed in all the cities.[3] Moses then adds that a king should be appointed, and prescribes the rules by which his policy and conduct were to be regulated. But he nowhere insinuates that the seventy ancients or elders constituted a permanent organization, or were to be introduced to the land of promise and there established as an integral part of the religious or political constitution which God gave to his people. Nor can it be said that the judges and magistrates appointed in the several cities were the successors of the 70 ancients, and thus perpetuated the existence of the tribunal instituted by Moses in the desert; for those judges and magistrates lived too far apart from each other to maintain even the appearance of a court or council, and, in fact, are not known to have ever met together for judicial or other purposes.

[1] Exod. xviii. 25. [2] Num. xi. 16. [3] Deut. xvi. 18.

Moses, assisted by his senate of seventy, exercised supreme authority. Josue, without a senate, issued his orders to priests and people, and his will was obeyed by both.[1] And when he condescends to consult others, it is not a senate or the elders, but the "princes" of the people that he thus honors.[2] In the turbulent times of the Judges there is no trace of any such tribunal as the Sanhedrim. Whoever during that calamitous period "did not that which seemed right to himself"[3] either paid a forced obedience to the common enemy, or displayed a precarious loyalty to the chieftain who for the time being stood forth, in the name of God, as the champion of his people. The record of Heli's administration, as well as that of Samuel's, exhibits no evidence of the results that would surely have followed from the presence and influence of any conciliar body like the Sanhedrim. Thus, when the scandalous conduct of Heli's son's was such that it "withdrew men from the sacrifice of the Lord,"[4] there is no tribunal to call them to account. It is Heli himself who performs that unpleasant duty.[5] And Samuel, as is well known, went about the country every year to judge Israel,[6] made war,[7] appointed, anointed, rebuked, and deposed the king[8] without assistance, counsel, or interference from any one but the Lord. During the entire period extending from the death of Samuel to the captivity of Babylon, the kings, by whom he was succeeded, ruled as autocrats, and regulated their policy on principles far different from those which they would have followed had a Sanhedrim, like the one described by Jewish writers, been at hand to counsel or control them. Most of them claimed to be exempt from all restraint, except such as their own arbitrary will imposed; and the best among

[1] Jos. i. 10, 16–18. [2] Ibid. ix. 15; xiv. 1. [3] Judges xvii. 6.
[4] I. Kings. ii. 17. [5] Ibid. 23–25. [6] I. Kings vii. 16.
[7] Ibid. 10. [8] Ibid. x. xiii., xv. xvi.

them held themselves responsible to no one but God. They may have had around them, like Solomon, [1] counsellors whose experience would be of service in great emergencies. But, like Solomon's silly son and successor, they could reject their advice, and shape their policy according to the suggestions of thoughtless youth, [2] or follow the course dictated by their own capricious judgment. And not one among them, from the first to the last, was ever placed on trial, or, judged by their history, would have allowed himself to be arraigned before any court, civil or religious, composed of his own subjects. With little or no opposition or interference from any quarter, they degraded high priests, appointed judges or sat in judgment themselves, commissioned generals, declared war, made peace, contracted alliances, inflicted capital punishment, with a will which, though in some of them upright, was generally as arbitrary as that of any modern oriental despot. In a country governed by such rulers there was no room for a tribunal like the Sanhedrim of the Talmudists.

For a long period after the return from Babylon there is no mention whatever of the Sanhedrim or any tribunal similar to it. All administrative power was at first possessed by Zorobabel, then by Esdras, and afterwards by Nehemias. And whatever measures were adopted for the restoration of the commonwealth, religious worship or moral dicipline are represented as originating with and enforced by one or all of these three. There is, indeed, reason for believing that Aggæus and Zacharias, as prophets, rendered important assistance in rebuilding Jerusalem; [3] but it is nowhere said, or even insinuated, that they, of themselves or with others, constituted a court or council, much less a tribunal resembling in any way the Sanhedrim of the

[1] III. Kings xii. 6. [2] Ibid. 14. [3] Esdras v. 1; vi. 14.

Rabbins. In fact, it is not until the Christian period is reached that any reference to a Sanhedrim is met with in sacred history, the first mention of the institution being found in the writings of the New Testament.[1] In Matt. v. 22 Our Lord Himself is represented as referring to the Sanhedrim as an actual and well known tribunal. But its prerogatives were insignificant compared with those claimed for it by the Rabbins; for, far from exercising independent and unlimited power in religious as well as civil matters, it could only call to account persons accused of violating the law of Moses, or the sanctity of the temple, as may be inferred from Matt. xxvi. 59, 61, 65; Acts vi. 12, 13; on such offenders it could even pronounce sentence of death. But whatever may have been the extent of the powers previously possessed by the Sanhedrim, under the Roman dominion all further proceedings in criminal cases could be suspended or interrupted by the representative of the civil government.[2] Without his authority capital punishment could not be inflicted;[3] and any one judged worthy of death by the Sanhedrim could be even set at liberty by him.[4]

Josephus, who was familiar with the laws and institutions of his countrymen, and has described them with great minuteness, refers to the Sanhedrim as a supreme court, which Moses directed to be established in "the holy city" for the purpose of deciding cases which the judges in the other cities might be unable to dispose of.[5] But he does not say that after the occupation of Canaan and the establishment of "the holy city," the direction of Moses in this matter was carried out. He also states,[6] that when endeavoring to prevent the people from engaging in rebellion against the Romans, he was acting under orders from the Sanhedrim in Jerusalem. And

[1] Matt. xxvi. 59; Mark xiv. 55; Luke xxii. 66; Acts iv. 15; v. 21 27.
[2] Acts xxiii. 23, 24. [3] John xviii., 31. [4] Ibid. xix. 7, 10.
Josephus *Antiq.*, B. iv., c. viii, § 14. [6] Ibid *Life* § 12.

treating of the reign of Hyrcanus II., which commenced B. C. 60, he represents the chief men of the Jews as declaring, that according to their law the life of no man could be taken who had not first been condemned to death by the Sanhedrim.[1] If, therefore, Josephus can be relied on—a somewhat uncertain point, the Sanhedrim in the time of Hyrcanus was in existence, and was recognized among the Jews as the only tribunal having jurisdiction in capital cases. But whether the origin of that tribunal can be assigned to an earlier date is doubted by many eminent writers. Catholics generally are agreed that its existence before or in the time of Esdras cannot be proved. Petavius[2] (d. 1652), refers its origin to the period when Gabinius was governor of Judea, 57 B. C. Calmet[3] (d. 1757) asserts that it was introduced in the Machabean period; so does Dixon.[4] Ubaldi[5] says that the existence of a Sanhedrim, properly so called, in the time of Esdras and Nehemias is affirmed by the Rabbins without sufficient reason. Protestant writers also very generally contend, that the Sanhedrim was founded at some date subsequent to the age of Esdras. Grotius[6] (d. 1645) refers its origin to the reign of the Herods. Basnage[7] (d. 1723) at first favored the opinion of Petavius, but, changing his mind, designated as the time when the Sanhedrim was founded the reign of Judas or Jonathas Machabeus, rather that of the latter. Stackhouse,[8] Vicar of Beenham, England, is of opinion that "the Machabees were the first institutors of the Sanhedrim." Prideaux[9] (d. 1724) states that the Sanhedrim existed before the time of Gabinius. Milman[10] remarks that "Ewald a German Protestant writer of the present

[1] *Ant.*, B. xiv., c. ix., § 3. [2] *De Doctr. temporum*, L. ii., c. 26.
[3] *De Politia et Sanhedrio Hebræorum.*
[4] *Introd. to the S. Scrip.*-1852. [5] *Introd. in S. Scrip.*, vol. ii. 148–1878.
[6] *Ad I. Paral.* xxi. 4. [7] *Hist. des Juifs*, L. i, c. 4.
[8] *Hist. of the Bible*, p. 767.—1846. [9] *Connex.* ii. 292.
[10] *Hist of the Jews*, ii. 113.—1874.

century, inclines to the opinion that it was founded by Ezra, but for once is not positive. Jost, a German Jew of this century, would date it from the time of Simon Machabeus. I think this the most probable date." W. L. Alexander, M. A., in Kitto's Cyclopedia (1852), states that the Sanhedrim existed before the time of Hyrcanus II. But Professor Smith of Aberdeen [1] appears certain "that the whole idea that there ever was a body called the Great Synagogue holding rule in the Jewish nation is a pure fiction;" and that the opinion that it "fixed the canon is a mere opinion of Elias Levita, a Jewish scholar contemporary with Luther."

All, however, concur in maintaining that the statements of rabbinical writers regarding the origin, duration, and authority of the Sanhedrim, and its composition in the time of Esdras, contain gross contradictions and palpable anachronisms, and are therefore to be rejected as fabulous. There is no question here as to those local establishments known as synagogues, which for some time before and after the commencement of the Christian era were to be found everywhere throughout Judea, and outside its limits, wherever any large number of Jews was to be met with. The officials of these synagogues, it is not to be denied, exercised some degree of authority over their members. They could punish offenders by expulsion or even scourging. [2] And when such power was exercised by them, it cannot be doubted that the Sanhedrim could, short of capital punishment, inflict severer penalties under the Roman governors. Whether there was an extradition treaty between Aretas and the ecclesiastical authority at Jerusalem is not known, but it is a curious fact that Saul, [3] armed with credentials by the High Priest to the synagogues at Damascus, started for that city in order to arrest and

[1] *The O.T. in the Jewish Church.* pp. 156. 157.

[2] John ix. 22; Mat. x. 22; Acts xxii. 19.

[3] Acts ix. 2.

drag to Jerusalem such Jews as had embraced the Christian religion. The origin of the local synagogues (places or meetings appointed for religious worship) may be traced to the period of the exile, as some suppose, or, as others believe, even much farther back—the time of the Judges. But even so, it by no means follows that there was among the political or theocratic institutions of the Jews a supreme court, whether it be called the Great Synagogue or Sanhedrim, maintaining an uninterrupted existence from the time of Moses until long after the final dispersion of the Jews, and clothed with unrestricted power, legislative, judicial, and executive, in all that concerned ecclesiastical and civil affairs. So far from that, the disjointed and incoherent details supplied by the Rabbins, in connection with the Sanhedrim in the time of Esdras particularly, have induced almost every critic to doubt whether the body styled in the New Testament Sanhedrim or council even then existed; and not a few to assert that it was not until long after Esdras had passed away, that even the comparatively unimportant tribunal so called in the Gospels and other Apostolic writings was created.

Yet, notwithstanding all the incredible details which the Rabbins and the author of IV. Esdras have grouped around the tradition which attributes the settlement of the Hebrew canon to Esdras the Scribe, it was not until after a lapse of several centuries that any Christian writer ventured to express a doubt regarding the accuracy of that tradition. Thus it has been seen, that up to the seventh century the Fathers who had occasion to refer to the subject generally regarded Esdras as the author of that canon. Nor does it appear that any one, for a long time after, believed that this opinion was even debatable. A careful study of the subject, however, at last forced on critics a suspicion that, while the Scriptures themselves fail to supply any evidence in favor of

the claim advanced in behalf of Esdras, they seem to present conclusive proof that the Hebrew canon, such as it is at present, could not have been the work of Esdras, since some of the books which it includes could not have been written before nor during his lifetime, while others refer to events that did not occur until long after he had closed his career. The Book of Nehemias, it can hardly be doubted, was written after the death of Esdras. The same may be said of the Book of Malachias, the last of the prophets. Both writers, though living in the time of Esdras, belonged to a later generation. And even if it be admitted that Esdras commenced, and Nehemias, with Malachias, continued the work necessary to collect, correct, and determine the sacred books, it is certain that the Hebrew canon in its present shape was not completed by either or both of them. For, in the Book of Nehemias[1] mention is made of Jeddoa, who was high priest when Alexander the Great entered Jerusalem,[2] and who survived the death of that prince two years, thus closing his career 215 years after the captivity, that is, in 322 B. C. And even the days of Jeddoa are mentioned as already passed and "recorded,"[3] as if the book had been written when Jeddoa had been already sometime dead. Besides, in I. Paral. iii. 19—24, the descendants of Zorobabel, the leader of the first band of captives who returned from Babylon, if he and the last on the list be each counted as a generation, are enumerated for 12 generations, which represent at the very least a period of 300 years, bringing down the record of that family to a date still later, that is to 236. B. C., when Onias II. was high priest, being the third after Simon the Just. Thus the posterity of Zorobabel is here traced to a time about half a century after the Hebrew Scriptures had been translated into Greek, and within 70 years of the date at which the Machabean period

[1] Neh. xii. 11. [2] Jos. *Antiq.*, B. xi., c. viii., § 5. [3] Neh. xii. 22.

commences. Whether the passages just referred to in I. Paral. and Nehemias be interpolations by an inspired pen, or the genuine statements of the authors by whom the books were written, they prove that at least they could not have had Esdras or any of his contemporaries as their author or editor, unless it be supposed that he or some of them lived to an age attained by no mortal since the patriarchal period. As a consequence of all this, the position taken by those who maintain that "in the time of Artaxerxes, which was the age of Esdras and Nehemias, the collection of the sacred books was completed by an authority which thenceforward ceased to exist,"[1] or by those who consider "Esdras ... to be the author of the canon"[2] must be abandoned. Prideaux,[3] in order to meet the difficulty, affirms that I. and II. Paral., Esdras, Nehemias, Esther, and Malachias were added to the canon in the time of Simon the Just, high priest after Onias, who succeeded Jeddoa; and his reason for so affirming is, that the books of Nehemias and probably Malachias were written after the time of Esdras, while the others were written by Esdras himself.[4] If, as is generally admitted, Nehemias and Malachias were not written before or at least during the lifetime of Esdras, he certainly could not have placed them on the canon. It is by no means certain that he wrote I. and II. Paral. and Esther, though his authorship of Esdras cannot well be doubted. But why, if he wrote all these books, he could not have added them to the canon, as Prideaux thinks, is not very clear. Unconvinced by the reasoning of Prideaux, Dr. Wright of Trinity College, Dublin, candidly acknowledges, that "we have no certain evidence as to the authority on which, or the time when, the Jewish canon was collected, or of the cause of its closing."[5] Reuss, a recent writer, and professor in the

[1] Kitto's *Cycl.*, art. *Canon.* [2] Ibid., art. *Ezra.* [3] *Connex.*, B. v.
[4] Ibid., B. viii. [5] Kitto's *Cycl.*, *Deutero canonical.*

university of Strasburg, asks this question: "Is it quite true, that the Hebrew canon, as we possess it, was closed before the time of the apostles?" and answers it by saying, "No one can prove it,"[1] and goes on to show "that in the time of Josephus the books called the Hagiographa[2] were not gathered into a clearly defined collection, and that certain Hebrew documents, which now form part of them, were unknown to that author." Professor Smith of Aberdeen, who wrote in 1881, states,[3] that in the sixteenth century it was currently believed in the Protestant churches that "the canon was completed by the men of the Great Synagogue," a body which, he maintains, "met once for all," as stated in Neh. viii. 10, and about which "everything that is told . . . except what we read in Nehemias, is" as we have already seen,[4] "pure fable of the later Jews." In view of such sentiments, expressed by men who still cherish some respect for the sacred volume, it is not to be expected that infidels and rationalists would hesitate to go at least the same length in the same direction. Hence Spinoza[5] (d. 1677) contends, that the canon of the Jews commenced by the ancient prophets was not completed and closed until the time of the Machabees, or the second century before Christ, while Bertholdt[6] and De Wette,[7] recent German writers, agree that the Hebrew canon was the result of no fixed plan, nor the work of any particular author, but that under the influence of fortuitous circumstances it gradually and imperceptibly assumed its present dimensions, long after the time of Esdras. The object of the schools represented by the last named writers is to get rid of the supernatural order altogether. Hence their criticism is aimed at the

[1] *Hist. of the canon of the H. Script.*, pp. 9, 10.—1884

[2] "Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Esdras, Nehemias, and Chronicles."

[3] *Hist. of the O. T. in the Jewish Church*, pp. 156, 157.

[4] Supra, p. 43.

[5] *Tract. Theolog. Polit.*, c. x.

[6] *Einleit.*, Tome i., p. 70, etc.

[7] *Einleit.*, § 13, 14.

overthrow of all testimony in favor of revelation, miracles, and prophecy.

A Lapide (d. 1637) takes no notice of the difficulty connected with I. Paral. iii. 19–24, but discusses with his usual learning that presented in Nehemias xii., saying that verse 11, as well as 22, was not written by Nehemias, but by the Jewish Synagogue, then infallible or by some inspired author after the death of Nehemias; that Nehemias could have seen Jeddoa when the latter was a child, but not after he became high priest. But even so à Lapide is compelled to suppose that "Esdras lived one hundred and forty-one years, and that Nehemias, like all others at the time, died after attaining a great age." It is to be observed, however, that there is nothing known with certainty regarding the age of Esdras and Nehemias at their death. According to some Jewish chronicles Esdras died the same year that Alexander the Great entered Jerusalem. According to other traditions, he died at the age of a hundred and twenty.[1] Calmet, in his commentary on Nehemias xii., cites several Catholic writers, according to whom the names of Jonathan and Joadda in verse 11 and verses 22, 23, and 24 were added by some writer who lived after Nehemias, as the latter must have been dead before the time of Jonathan and Jeddoa. But Calmet believes that, since verse 22 is considered to have been written by Nehemias, we must suppose that Nehemias, at his death, had reached the age of one hundred and thirty-eight years, a matter not at all improbable in view of the long life of Esdras and Sanballat, who is mentioned in Nehemias xiii. 28. This looks like proving one supposition by making another, a defect which seems inherent also in the explanation of à Lapide; for the age of Esdras, Nehemias, and Sanballat is problematical. The genealogy contained in I. Paral. iii.

[1] Kitto, *Cyclopedia*, *Ezra*.

19–24 has the names of four great-grandfathers, and all these, as great-grandfathers, must have been seen by or been living in the time of Esdras or Nehemias, if these names were written by either. Calmet on this point is, therefore, compelled to say that the author of I. Paral., "as we have it, is evidently a different man from Esdras, since from Zorobabel to the tenth generation after him at least three hundred years passed, even though an average of only thirty years be assigned to each generation." It will thus be seen that, even if it be supposed, as some suggest, that the Jeddoa of the Book of Nehemias is not identical with, but one who lived earlier than the Jaddus, or Jado of Josephus; and that Esdras, or Nehemias, or even both, lived to an unusually old age, it will be difficult to conceive how the Jewish tradition regarding the fixing and closing of the canon for all time to come can be reconciled with what is said in I. Paral. iii. and Nehemias xii.; and the only possible way out of the difficulty will be to say, as several writers have proposed, that the verses in question were added by some inspired hand after the time of Esdras and Nehemias, just as the last chapter in the Books of Moses was not written by him, but after his death, by Josue or one of the prophets. But from adopting this hypothesis we seem again debarred by the aforesaid tradition. For, whereas it is admitted by all, that, when Moses died, there still remained an authority competent to complete his writings, and add to the canon as he left it, the tradition in question forbids the supposition that the canon was not closed until three hundred years after the generation to which Zorobabel belonged, or until the time of Alexander the Great, the earliest period, it seems, at which the last word in the Hebrew Scriptures could have been written.

CHAPTER IV.

Christian Critics on the Formation of the Jewish Canon.

The opinion which, apart from details connected with the subject, has prevailed among and is still generally advocated by Catholic writers, regarding the formation of the Hebrew canon, is, that it was principally the work of Esdras, and that, having been submitted to the Sanhedrim of the time, it was approved by that body, but not closed for all time to come. A similar opinion was held at first by Protestants, who, however, maintained that, the prophetic spirit having ceased with Esdras, no further additions could be made to his canon. Hence, in all their editions of the Bible, although they included the deutero books, they placed them by themselves at the end of the Old Testament, or between the Old and New, and under some special title, denoting either that they were of inferior authority, or were not divinely inspired like the rest of the Holy Scriptures, till at last these books disappeared altogether from many Bibles published under Protestant auspices. But further study of the subject convinced the descendants of those who at first degraded, then repudiated the deutero books, that the final closing of the canon in the time of Esdras could not be insisted on; and most of them adopted the opinion, that the labors of Esdras on the canon were continued after his death by several other eminent men; Simon the Just and certain members of the Great Synagogue,

having added to the canon some books which, not having been written before or during the lifetime of Esdras, he could not have placed on the roll of Sacred Scriptures. At present not a few Protestant critics [1] maintain, that the Hebrew canon was not completed even in the time of Simon the Just; and that there is no evidence to show, that the canon had attained its present dimensions, until after the commencement of the Christian era.

There is hardly a question connected with the Christian religion, which has been the occasion of so much speculation as the canon of the Old Testament; and writers of all shades of belief as well as of none, Catholics, Protestants, rationalists, and infidels, have taken part in its discussion. Why, it is asked, are there two canons—a long and a short one—the former advocated by Catholics, the latter by Protestants and Jews? Why attribute to Esdras the Jewish canon, since it embraces books which Esdras could never have seen, or at least statements which he could never have written? Why, even if it be assumed that Esdras was the author of that canon, do we find the disciples of Hillel and Shammai, as late as the end of the first Christian century, disputing about the canonicity of certain books now found thereon? Why is it that no inspired writer, Jewish or Christian, has even hinted that Esdras had anything whatever to do with collecting and compiling a catalogue of sacred books? Why all this, if the Jewish canon, as we have it, was the work of Esdras? Again, why is it that the Hellenistic or Greek-speaking Jews, for several centuries before and after the coming of Christ, made use of a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures which contained much more than is now found in the Hebrew Bible? Why is it that Our Lord and His

[1] Hunter's Translation of Reuss's *Hist. of the Canon of H. Script.*, 309–314, note 339.

apostles often quote texts, not as read in the Hebrew Bible, but as read in that translation? Why is it that the writers of the New Testament borrow ideas and language from, if they do not actually cite books contained in that translation, but omitted in Hebrew Bibles? Why do Josephus and Philo, both learned Jews, make use of the Scriptures contained in that translation? Why does the former introduce as "Scripture" a text nowhere found in a proto, but contained in a deutero book? [1] Why, while some of the Fathers place the deutero books outside the canon, yet quoting them as Scripture, do others include them in the canon and cite them as divine? Why all this and much more of the same sort?

These questions were the subject of occasional comment from almost the very dawn of Christian history; but they can hardly be said to have received special attention, or to have provoked general discussion, before the sixteenth century. Since then, various theories have been proposed in order to account for the difficulties which these questions present.

Genebrard [2] (d. 1597), a French Benedictine, is of opinion that three canons were drawn up among the Jews. The first, made in the time of Esdras and established by the Great Synagogue in what he calls the fifth synod. The second, made under the auspices of Eleazar, the High Priest, in a council named by Genebrard the sixth synod, and convened for the purpose of deliberating on the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures demanded by Ptolemy, King of Egypt, and now known as the Septuagint. "It was on this occasion," says Genebrard, "that the books of Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Baruch (unless, as seems probable, it was already on the Esdrine canon) were edited. The third canon was formed in the time of John Hyrcanus, on the occasion of the seventh synod, which was con-

[1] II. *Contra Apion.*, § 25.

[2] *Chron.*, L. 2.

voked in order to confirm the sect of the Pharisees, of which Hillel and Shammai were the chiefs, and to condemn Sadoc and Barjetos, promoters of the sect called Sadducees. At that synod the two books of Machabees were placed on the canon, and the two preceding canons confirmed, in spite of the Sadducees, who, like the Samaritans, refused to recognize as divine any but the five Books of Moses. It is hardly necessary to observe that there is no reason whatever to suppose that such synods were ever held, and that the theory of which they form the ground-work has met with few advocates.

Serarius[1] (d. 1609) a learned Jesuit and a native of Lorraine, after a careful study of the subject, came to the conclusion that two canons had been drawn up, one by Esdras and preserved unchanged by the Palestinian Jews, and another, which, besides the books in the Esdrine canon, included the deutero books, and was used by the Hellenists or foreign Jews, especially those of Alexandria, and subsequently by Our Lord and His apostles, who gave it their sanction and delivered it to the Church. This theory was afterwards advocated by Tournemine[2] (d. 1739), also a Jesuit, and other writers, not only Catholics but rationalists, who are mentioned by Cornely, a Jesuit, and the author of a recent "Introduction to the Sacred Scripture," in which the opinion of Serarius is ably defended. It seems also to have been embraced by Vincenzi[3] and Franzelin.[4]

Richard Simon, a French Oratorian (d. 1712), maintained[5] that Esdras collected together the ancient Scriptures, "here and there abridging and changing," as he thought necessary; and that "those books are no more

[1] *Proleg.* c. viii. § xvi.

[2] *Append. ad Præloq. Banfrerii.*, Art. 1. Parisiis. 1885, vol., p. 51.

[3] *Sessio Quarta Conc. Trid.*, Part. xi., 34.

[4] *De Divina Trad. et Script.*, pp. 444, 449, note. *Hist. critiq.*, L. i., c. 1.

than abridgments of memoirs much more extensive;" in short, that the books on the Hebrew canon are merely a compendium by Esdras of the sacred records extant in his time. The arguments advanced in support of this theory are generally considered altogether incompetent. First, because the supposition, (it is nothing more), that that part of the Old Testament written before the captivity of Babylon is a mere compendium, which Esdras made of the books then extant, is opposed to the well founded and common sentiment, which has prevailed from time immemorial among Jews and Christians, and is not mentioned by a single writer who preceded Simon, by whom it was conceived and with whom it seems to have died. Second, because the Samaritan Pentateuch, generally supposed to belong to a date anterior to the age of Esdras, agrees substantially with the Hebrew Pentateuch. Now, if the latter be a compendium, so must the former. That is, the compendium preceded the person by whom it was made, or the Samaritans allowed an enemy (for such they considered Esdras) to prepare for them an abstract of the Mosaic writings. If so, why did they not also adopt his abstract of the other sacred writings? Third, because the supposition cannot be reconciled with the practice of Our Lord and His apostles, who are everywhere represented in the New Testament, when quoting the Old, as using the very words of the writer whom they cite. Thus, when Moses, or David, or Solomon or any of the prophets is appealed to by them, the reader is given to understand that it is the language of the author named that is cited, and not that put into his mouth by an abbreviator. Fourth, because, were the supposition correct, there would be no diversity of style and treatment between one book and another, as is the case at present. Nor would the more ancient books, as they do now, contain archaic, pure, and unadulterated Hebrew, while the

latter books are free from all such expressions, and are written in a language which already exhibits traces of the influence exercised on it by the idioms of the various nations, with which the Jews were brought in contact after their settlement in Canaan. Fifth, because the writings, which treat of events that occurred before the time of Esdras, exhibit redundancies, repetitions, and apparent contradictions, all of which would certainly have disappeared under the treatment of such a skilful and experienced scribe as Esdras, had he undertaken to re-write or condense the whole. These considerations make it certain, that the sacred text has never been subjected to such an ordeal as the one through which it must have passed, were the theory of Simon anything more than a groundless conjecture.

Huet, Bishop of Avranches (d. 1721), considered [1] it most likely, that until the time of Christ the only canon in existence was that in which Esdras had borne by far the principal part, receiving, however, important assistance from Nehemias, who, as intimated, [2] gave an account of his own doings, and perhaps of those of others, adding to the canon his own book, as Esdras had added his. The canon being thus completed was approved by the Great Synagogue of the time, the only body competent to sanction solemnly such a work. When the storm excited by the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes had subsided, Judas Machabeus [3] undertook the care of the sacred books, collected again those which had been lost in the war, and replenished the "library" of Nehemias. The Hellenists highly esteemed the deutero books, but never admitted them into their canon, nor was it until long after that the Church of Christ received them into her canon. According to Huet, therefore, the Jews, whether Palestinian or Hellenistic, had but one

[1] *Demonst. Evang., ed. Venet.* 1733, pp. 343, 344.

[2] II. Mach. ii. 13. [3] Ibid. 14.

canon, that of which Esdras is said to be the principal author; this theory has been reproduced in its main features and advocated recently by Professor Ubaldi of Rome.[1]

Frassen, a French Franciscan (d. 1711) whose opinion[2] was adopted by some other critics, seems, like Huet, to have been impressed, but in a different way, by the statement in II. Mach. ii. He supposed that a recension of the Esdrine canon was made by Nehemias; and that this recension is referred to in II. Mach. ii. 13, where it is said that "these same things were set down in the memoirs and commentaries of Nehemias, when he made a library and gathered together out of the countries the books of the prophets and of David, and the epistles of the Kings, concerning the holy gifts." It is also argued by those who favor this theory, that there was another recension of the canon by Judas Machabeus, and they assign as a reason for this belief the statement contained in the two verses immediately after the one just cited. "In like manner Judas also gathered together all such things as were lost by the war we had, and they are now in our possession. Wherefore, if you want these things, send some that may fetch them." These passages were in the epistles addressed by the Jews of Jerusalem to their brethren in Egypt, and warrant, it is argued by the advocates of this theory, the conclusion that the Esdrine canon was completed by the labors of Nehemias and Judas Machabæus, who also added to the sacred collection the so called deutero books, after it had been commenced by Esdras.

A theory similar in its main features to the preceding has been recently advanced by several German Catholic critics, as Movers,[3] Neteler,[4] and Danko.[5] These

[1] *Introductio in Sac. Scripturam.* Romæ, 1878. [2] *Disquis. biblicæ.*

[3] *De utriusque recens. vat. Jeremiæ indepen.*

[4] *Die Bücher Esdras, Nehemias, und Esther,* etc.

[5] *De S. Script. ejusque interpretatione Commentarius.*

writers are generally of opinion that the sacred books were collected, edited, and approved three times. First-by Esdras; second, by Nehemias; and third, in the time of the Machabees (II. Mach. ii. 14). The Judas mentioned in this text Neteler supposes to have been not Judas Machabæus, but Judas the Essene, who, according to Josephus [1] was a great prophet in the time of John Hyrcanus and Aristobulus. In fact, this conjecture of Neteler was made long before by A Lapide, [2] and seems required by the theory, as the Machabean books record events which happened after the death of Judas Machabeus. Danko contends that the Jewish tradition regarding the Great Synagogue with Esdras at its head is a fable, because there is no mention of it in the books of Esdras and Nehemias, and it is even contradicted by Esdras ix., x. and Nehemias viii. He further insists that the sacred books were watched over by the prophets and other holy men, until the return from the exile; and that neither Esdras nor the Great Synagogue completed the collection at that time; although he admits that Esdras did then make a collection, a work in which, however, he had been preceded by Jeremias, as intimated in II. Mach. ii. 2. To the collection made by Esdras, Nehemias added other books. But as the genealogical statements contained in Paral. and Nehemias, and already referred to, [3] could not have been written by either Esdras or Nehemias, these books, as well as others, appeared at a later period, and were added to the collection. "And thus it seems probable that the growth of the canon was gradual, and that it was at last finished in the time of the Machabees."

Quite recently Rev. William E. Addis and Thomas Arnold, late Fellows of the Royal University of Ireland,

[1] *Ant.*, B. xiii., c. xi. § 2; *Wars*, B. i., c. iii., § 5.

[2] See his *Commentary*.

[3] p. 48.

and devoted as well as learned members of the Church, have expressed themselves regarding the canon in terms which, by many accustomed to the common opinions advocated by Catholic writers on the subject, will be considered bold, novel, and even startling. After a cursory but sufficiently searching examination of the evidence in favor of an Esdrine canon on the one hand, and of a Hellenistic canon on the other, the conclusion reached by these two critics is that, "In any case, the Christian Church never received the canon of Scripture from the Jews, because till long after the Jews had rejected Christ they had no fixed canon." This conclusion is based principally on the now notorious fact that, as previously stated, "During the first century A. D. the canonicity of Canticles and Ecclesiasticus was still disputed in the Jewish Schools." [1]

Let us now see what, according to their own statements, has been the course of criticism among Protestant writers, regarding the canon of the Old Testament. It cannot be doubted, that the reformers and their first successors did practically accept the results of Jewish scholarship, as to the number of books in the canon. So says Professor Smith. [2] And although their great leader, Luther, expressed himself in such a way as to show that he seriously doubted, rather questioned, the canonicity of Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Esther, Job, and other books, according to Reuss, [3] it is certain that "in the sixteenth century" it was commonly held "in the Protestant churches" that "the canon was completed by a body of men known as the Great Synagogue . . . . and represented as a permanent council, under the presidency of Ezra" [4] (Esdras). It was, however, not then

[1] *Catholic Dictionary*, Art. *Canon of the Scripture.*

[2] *The O. Test. in the Jewish Church*, p. 46.

[3] *History of the Canon of the H. Script.*, pp. 330, 331.

[4] *The O. Test. in the Jewish Church*, p. 156.

perceived that there was much in the Hebrew canon which Esdras could not have written or have had inserted. This was discovered afterwards, and some theory had to be devised, in order to account for the presence in the canon of statements referring to events long subsequent to the time in which Esdras lived. Among those who undertook to do so, Prideaux, Protestant dean of Norwich, has been assigned a prominent place for his learning and industry, but not for his success in this particular task. .

In fact, Prideaux's theory, though proposed for a different purpose, is hardly less objectionable than that of Richard Simon, which has just been discussed. According to Prideaux, [1] "the great work of Esdras was his collecting together and setting forth a correct edition of the Holy Scriptures, which he labored much in, and went a great way in the perfection of it." Again, "He collected together all the books of which the Holy Scripture did then consist, and disposed them in their proper order, and settled the canon of Scripture for his time." [2] But "It is most likely that the two Books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, as well as Malachi, were afterwards added, in the time of Simon the Just, and that it was not till then that the Jewish canon of the Holy Scriptures was fully completed." [3] Moreover "Ezra .... added in several places throughout the books of this edition what appeared necessary for the illustrating, connecting, or completing of them; wherein he was assisted by the same Spirit by which they were at first wrote." [4] Prideaux then mentions several passages, including the entire last chapter of Deuteronomy, which, according to him, Esdras interpolated in the books of the Old Testament; and adds that, "Many more instances of such interpolated passages might be

[1] *Connexion*, vol. i., p. 270.
[2] Ibid., 272, 273.
[3] Ibid., 271, 272.
[4] Ibid., 279.

given."[1] For all this there is not a particle of proof in the Scriptures themselves, in the statement of any respectable ancient writer, or in any well authenticated tradition. Besides, the presence in the sacred text of the passages mentioned, could be and has been easily explained, without invoking a wholesale interpolation by Esdras. It is indeed hard to see in what Prideaux's gratuitous supposition (for what else is it?) differs from that other, according to which Esdras, aided by the Holy Ghost, restored all the divine books when lost. If, as Prideaux believes, the last chapter of Deuteronomy was written by Esdras with the assistance of the holy Spirit, might not Esdras with the same assistance have written every other chapter in that particular book, or, for that matter, even all the books? where is the difference? The dean has not failed to inform his readers that some of the Fathers were mistaken in asserting, on the authority "of the second (fourth) apocryphal book of Esdras, that Ezra restored all the Scriptures, when lost and destroyed, by divine revelation."[2] But these Fathers might retort by asking their censor, in what does this differ from restoring the whole or portions thereof by divine "interpolation"?

Prideaux wrote in the first quarter of the last century. As an indication of the immense stride in Biblical criticism made since then by English Protestants, who in this department of science sound the key-note for their transatlantic coreligionists, dancing themselves, however, to the music of Protestant Germany, it will not be out of place to reproduce here the substance of some remarks on the canon by Rev. Samuel Davidson, professor of Biblical literature in the Independent College, Manchester. This critic, whose scholarly attainments have been highly esteemed by all, who believe that the pure word of God is to be sought

[1] *Connexion*, vol. i., p. 279. [2] Ibid., 270.

in the Protestant Bible and nowhere else; while discussing the question before us, says,[1] that a list of canonical books was drawn up three times: first, by Ezra; second, by Nehemiah; and third, at a later period, when the youngest portion of the canon consisted of Daniel (between 170 and 160 B. C.), and probably of several psalms, which were inserted in different places of the collection, so as to make the whole number one hundred and fifty. The list continued open, and no stringent principle guided selection. The canon, however, was not considered closed in the first century before, and the first century after Christ. The closing of the canon in the time of Ezra, or at any time before Christ, is a rabbinical fable; the wonder is that any intelligent Protestant could ever have believed anything else. There were doubts about some portions, Ezekiel, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Esther, and Proverbs. And these doubts, though suppressed for a while after 32 B. C., re-appeared about A. D. 65, when all were admitted to the canon except Ecclesiastes, which was probably excluded, but, along with Canticles, was assigned to the Hagiographa in the Synod of Jamnia, about A. D. 90. But as the Hagiographa was not read in public, with the exception of Esther, opinions of Jewish Rabbins might still differ about Canticles and Ecclesiastes, even after the Synod of Jamnia.

Such, in a condensed form, but as nearly as possible in his own words, is what Dr. Davidson has written regarding the manner and time in which the Hebrew canon was formed. Now, before A. D. 90, any authority which the highest spiritual tribunal among the Jews possessed in order to distinguish between divine and human writings, had either become absolutely extinct and disappeared from earth, or had been transferred in its plen-

[1] *Encylop. Britt., Canon.*

itude to the Church. If, therefore, Davidson be right, either it is no longer possible to know what is or is not God's written word, and all discussion about the canon of Scripture is labor lost; or, outside the Church, which succeeded the Synagogue, it is impossible for any one to say what books belong to the Bible, or whether there be a Bible at all, as that word is understood.

It thus appears that the Jewish tradition, which attributed to Esdras the formation as well as the completion of the Hebrew canon, and which was received as unquestionable by the most eminent writers of Christian antiquity, and by them transmitted to subsequent generations, as embodying a fact equally certain almost with any other recorded in the Scriptures, has in recent times excited hardly less doubt than the most incredible of the many absurd details which rabbinical exaggeration has interwoven with it. Nor is this remarkable; for that tradition was not committed to writing until long after Esdras had passed away. In fact, six if not seven full centuries must have intervened between his death and the earliest date at which, so far as known, any written notice of that tradition appeared. During that long interval, in the greater part of which they maintained their national existence, and enjoyed comparative tranquillity, the Jews raised not a monument, instituted not a feast, traced not a single line in their public archives or private records, to perpetuate the recollection of the event to which the tradition in question refers; though events in their history certainly not more important than the settlement of their canon, instead of being exposed to the danger of utter oblivion by being transmitted orally from generation to generation, were duly recorded, or publicly commemorated from year to year on some day especially set apart for the purpose; or were so interwoven with their litera-

ture or religion, that, so long as either remained, it might be confidently appealed to for proof that such events had actually occurred. Thus the Grecian and Egyptian Jews are said by Philo [1] to have assembled every year at the island of Pharos, and there to have celebrated by a public festival the translation of the Scriptures into Greek. And it is certain that the dedication of the Temple by Judas Machabæus, described in I. Mach. iv., was commemorated from year to year by a solemn octave, which was called the Feast of Lights by Josephus,[2] was observed in the time of Our Lord,[3] and appears to be still observed by the Jews.[4] The Feast of Purim, or Lots, was also instituted to commemorate the deliverance of the Jews from the wicked designs of Aman, as related in the book of Esther, "and still is celebrated by the Jews."[5] It had its name from the lots cast by Aman to fix the day for their destruction, and has been at all times religiously observed by them. Yet, of the expurgation and compilation of their sacred books by Esdras, and the authoritative sanction given to his work by the Great Synagogue at the same time, no monument was preserved, the event was honored by the institution of no festival, nor was there anything written or said about it before the Talmudic period.

Now, from the time of Esdras until the destruction of the Jewish commonwealth, and even after that, several works, sacred and profane, were written by Jewish authors. Many of them are still extant; as, the deutero books of the Old Testament, *all* the books of the New (if the Jewish extraction of Luke be admitted), together with the writings of Josephus and Philo, both of whom

[1] *Life of Moses*, B. II. cvii. [2] *Ant.*, B. xii., c. 7, § 7.

[3] John x. 22.—See also *Comment.* of the Methodist Adam Clarke.

[4] Calmet, on I. Mach. iv. 59.

[5] Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, Vol. i, 477; iii. 36, 449—Calmet, *Comment. on Esther*, ix. 23.

were thoroughly versed in the history and literature of their own nation. Yet the reader will peruse all these writings from beginning to end, without finding a single allusion to Esdras as connected in any way with the formation of the Hebrew canon; although the Scriptures themselves are very frequently mentioned therein, thus rendering it certain that these were not only in existence, but that they were well known. Indeed, the notion of a canon or collection of sacred books by Esdras is never once hinted at by any of these writers. Such persistent silence on the part of those who wrote the Old Testament deutero books, of those who wrote the New Testament, as well as of Josephus and Philo, especially in regard to a matter which, at least for some of them, must have had some interest, if not considerable importance, is exceedingly singular and suggestive. Though the silence of all these writers, and indeed, so far as is known, of all other Jewish authors, from the end of the Babylonian captivity to long after the beginning of the Christian period, may amount to no more than a negative proof that the relation of Esdras to the Scripture was nothing more than simply what is said of him therein: that "he was a ready scribe in the Law of Moses; had prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord, and to do and to teach in Israel the commandments and judgment," as is stated in the book of which he is believed to be the author (Esdras vii. 6, 10); and that at the request of the people he brought the Book of the Law of Moses before them, and read it to them, and the Levites interpreted it to them (Nehemias viii.)—yet that proof is not to be ruled out, unless direct and positive evidence to the contrary be produced. And, certainly the Jewish tradition about the origin of the canon is not of a character to be treated as such.

Besides, when Esdras and Nehemias were giving an account of all that had been done by the former in

rebuilding the temple, restoring religious worship and discipline, instructing the people, and reading the law to them, it must appear unaccountable that nothing is said by either about one of the most important services which Esdras is reported to have performed, that of enabling for all time to come his coreligionists to distinguish with unerring certainty sacred from profane compositions, by providing them with a catalogue of those books which, to the exclusion of all others, were to be regarded as dictated by God himself. Nor is this all. Josephus, as is well known, not only recounts the facts recorded in the sacred history of the Jews, but comprises in his writings many statements which are not found in that history, and which he must have fabricated out of national vanity, or derived from the traditional lore current among his countrymen. Thus he occupies the entire second chapter of the twelfth book of his *Antiquities* with the story current among the Jews of his time about the incidents connected with the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek -a story attributed to Aristeas, a Jew, and repeated by Philo,[1] another Jew, before Josephus embodied it in his work. Now, can it be supposed, that such a writer would have omitted to tell his readers, that an authoritative catalogue of the divine books was made by Esdras, had there been at the time he composed his *Antiquities* any testimony, written or traditional, to show that such was the case? Yet he never once refers to the matter, though he devotes the greater part of chapter v., book XI., of his *Antiquities* to the doings of Esdras at Babylon and Jerusalem, and even states that Esdras from morning to noon read the laws of Moses to the people on the Feast of Tabernacles. When he so stated, then, if ever, he was bound to place on record the tradition which assigned to Esdras the authorship of the canon,

[1] *Life of Moses*, B. II.

had any such tradition been known to him. Once more; when against Apion. i. 8 Josephus had occasion to make mention of the 22 books, the circumstances were such as to call for some reference to the labors of Esdras on the canon, had Josephus ever heard of these labors. That on neither occasion did he make any allusion whatever to the subject can hardly be explained in any other way, than by supposing that, though well informed about all Esdras had done in restoring the religious and political institutions of the Jews, he had never heard that Esdras had provided them with an approved canon of the Scriptures.

If therefore it be true, as the Rabbins maintain, that Esdras was the author of their canon, and even worthy to have been the lawgiver if Moses had not preceded him,[1] is it not surprising, that in the only three instances—in which he is referred to in his relation to the Scriptures, before the Talmudic period—once in the book which goes by his own name, once in that of Nehemias, and once in the writings of Josephus—he should be mentioned simply as *a ready scribe in the Law of Moses*, *a reader of the Law*, *very skilful in the Law of Moses*, but nowhere as the author of the canon; that even no notice whatever should have been taken of his reported connection with the canon by any of the writers of the deutero books of the Old Testament, or of the books of the New—his name not being even mentioned in any of the former or latter, and actually omitted in the list of illustrious men contained in Ecclesiasticus,[2] while Zorobabel, Nehemias, and Simon the Just appear therein; and that the earliest reference to him, as in any way concerned with or engaged in the formation of a canon, has to be sought in the apocryphal book called IV. Esdras; if it be not the production of an age later than that in which the Tal-

[1] *Bab. Sanhed.*, c. ii., f. 21.

[2] Eccli. xlix. 1.

mud appeared? In other words, as before remarked, some six or seven centuries had come and gone since the generation to which Esdras belonged had passed away, before anything, so far as can now be known, had been said or written regarding the eminent services he is reported to have rendered by his labors on the sacred compositions of those inspired men by whom he had been preceded. On the strength of rabbinical testimony it was once generally believed, that Esdras substituted the present Hebrew square letters for the older Semitic characters, in which the Scriptures were originally written. That the change was made, is certain, but when or by whom nobody now knows. That he also introduced the vowel points into the text was also considered indisputably certain. In fact, many Protestants believed them to be essential parts of the text. That, however, is no longer believed by any one. For it is now universally admitted, that these points were not invented until the sixth or seventh century of our era.[1] Thus the traditions, which have so long clustered around the sacred memory of Esdras, disappear one by one, till at last probably nothing will be left to take their place, except what is told in the simple but inspired words which he himself and Nehemias have written.

[1] R. Cornely, S. J., *Introd. in S. Script.*, vol. I., pp. 241, 242.

CHAPTER V.

THE DEUTERO BOOKS ORIGINALLY INCLUDED IN THE JEWISH CANON.

At the very least it is, therefore, not at all certain that Esdras, with or without the Great Synagogue, was the author of the Hebrew canon. Nor is there any trustworthy human testimony to prove where or by whom that Canon was made; while critics, in searching the Scriptures for light on the subject, have so far been unable to reach a common conclusion. But whereas even Rabbins in the great assembly at Jamnia,[1] about A. D. 90, felt at liberty to express doubts regarding the canonicity of Ecclesiastes and Canticles, it would seem to follow, that the collection as a whole could not have been definitely settled much, if even at all, before that time. The discussion at Jamnia, as reported in the Mishna, Tract *Iadaim* iii. 5, is worth being repeated here.

"All the Holy Scriptures defile[2] the hands: Canticles and Ecclesiastes defile the hands. R. Judah said, Canticles defiles the hands, and Ecclesiastes is disputed. R. Jose said, Ecclesiastes does not defile the hands, and Canticles is disputed. R. Simon said, Ecclesiastes belongs to the light things of the school of Shammai,

[1] This was a town in the territory of the tribe of Judah, where the Jews had a celebrated school and sanhedrim. It is also called Jebna or Yebna and Jabneh.—*Geography of Palestine*, by Ritter, iii., 244.

[2] In order to "put a hedge about the law" as directed in the Talmud (supra p. 33), and thus prevent the sacred books from being used universally or for common purposes, the Rabbins decided that their touch "defiles the hands" and food, thus communicating legal uncleanness.

and the heavy things of the school of Hillel (i. e., the former is more strict about the matter than the latter). R. Simeon, son of Azai, said, I received it as a tradition from the seventy-two elders, that this point was decided on that day, when the office was assigned to R. Eleazar, son of Azarias. R. Akiba said, by no means; no Israelite has ever doubted that Canticles defiles the hands: for no day in the history of the world is to be more esteemed than that in which Israel received this book. For all the Hagiographa are sacred, but Canticles is particularly sacred. If there has been any dispute, it was about Ecclesiastes. R. Johanan, the son of Josua, the son of the father-in-law of R. Akiba, said: so, as the son of Azai said, it was disputed, and so it was decided." Similar disputes about Proverbs are found in Tr. Sabbath 30; about Ezechiel in Tr. Sabb. 13; about Esther, in Tr. Sanhedr. 100, etc.

To impair the force of this testimony, it has been observed, that these doubts and denials no more prove that the canonicity of the books in question was not admitted by the Jews at the time, than does the rejection of Job, Canticles, and Proverbs by Theodore of Mopsuestia prove, that these books were not then in the Christian canon. This answer, however, is quite incompetent. For Theodore in life was known as a heretic on other points, and as such publicly condemned after death by the Fifth Ecumenical council; whereas the rabbinical disputants who wrangled over and denied the canonicity of Canticles, Ecclesiastes, etc., were regarded as otherwise orthodox by their own brethren.

In consequence of the controversies now known to have been carried on among the Rabbins regarding the canon at so late a period, Protestant writers, to whom at first the rejection of the entire Old Testament would have appeared hardly less impious than the denial of an Esdrine canon, are now very generally disposed

to hold, that the Old Testament canon was not definitely "fixed until the close of the first century."[1] Thus, in a matter to them of prime importance, there have been three theories among the Reformers and their descendants. First, it was believed that the Old Testament canon was the work of Esdras. Second, that, though principally the work of Esdras, it continued to grow under the care of other authorized persons, until brought to its present condition. Third, as now held by the most advanced Protestant critics, it was not sealed, settled, and approved by the Jews until about the end of the first century after Christ. For Catholics the question has very little importance, as their creed is regulated, not by what this or that book says, but by what the Church teaches. Nor is it likely that they would feel much interest in its discussion, were it not that attempts at repudiating writings proclaimed divine by the Church have forced on them the duty of defending their canonicity. In doing so they have expressed a variety of opinions. But all these opinions may be reduced to three, with some shades of difference, particularly in the details of the first. One is that held (as already explained) by Genebrard, Frassen, Huet, Danko, Neteler, Movers, Ubaldi and others. All these critics believe, that until the time of Our Lord there had been but one canon, that canon according to some being the present Hebrew or Palestinian canon, which, however, was superseded by the Hellenistic or Alexandrian, when Our Lord and His Apostles delivered the latter to the Church; according to others of the same school being, indeed, the present Hebrew canon, enlarged, however, by the addition of the deutero books, which were inserted therein by competent authority before the time of Our Lord. A second opinion is that there were two canons, one the Palestinian, comprising the books now in the

[1] *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 154.

Hebrew canon, another the Alexandrian, being the Palestinian enlarged by the addition of the deutero books. This opinion, as we have seen, is advocated by Serarius, Tournemine, Vincenzi, Franzelin, as well as others (the latest of whom is Cornely), and even some non-Catholic critics. A third opinion, which has been advanced by the writers of *The Catholic Dictionary,* is too recent to have attracted much attention, but may in time be considered equally probable with either of the other two, if it does not supersede both. Its advocates deny that the Jews had a fixed canon until long after the time of Christ; and in confirmation of their denial remind their readers, that it is in evidence that even after the time of Christ the canonicity of several books now found in the Hebrew Old Testament was a subject of dispute among rabbinical teachers, which would not have been the case, had there been at the time a Hebrew canon; that, although no quotations from the Old Testament deutero books are found in the New Testament, just as several Old Testament proto books are not once cited by the writers of the New Testament, yet allusions in the New Testament to these deutero books are frequent and unmistakable; that out of about 350 quotations from the Old Testament in the New, 300 are from LXX, which contains the deutero books; that the New Testament will be searched in vain for any list of Old Testament books received by Our Lord and His apostles; and that it is proved from tradition that the full list of Old Testament books, including the deutero, was authorized by the apostles. There is not certainly in Scripture nor in tradition anything to prove, that before the time of Christ there was a definite number of sacred writings universally received as such by the Jews. They had some that were well known and recognized among them as divine; yet it is certain they had others, which are now in their canon, but which were not

placed thereon by them, until many years after the commencement of the Christian era. Indeed, the canon of the Church, embracing both the Old and New Testament deutero as well as proto books, may have been settled before anything of the kind was done for their Scriptures by the Jews, who may have been induced to move at last in this matter by the example of their Christian neighbors, who had adopted the Alexandrian canon.

Just here, therefore, seems to be the proper place for some remarks on the Old Testament, which, containing the Alexandrian canon, circulated among the Hellenists for over two hundred years before the coming of Our Lord. That volume, divested of all the fabulous details with which the Jews have endeavored to embellish its origin, and which even some of the early Christians regarded as sober history, is a Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, and contains, besides, some other books, originally written in Greek by Jewish authors. It was made in Alexandria, Egypt, —being therefore sometimes called the Alexandrian version—was commenced hardly, if any, later than 290 B. C., and was completed at least very soon after. All this is certain. But it is also called the Septuagint—LXX—because it is said to have been made by 72—in round numbers 70—interpreters, six from each of the twelve tribes of Israel, whom Eleazar the High Priest, at the request of king Ptolemy Philadelphus, sent from Jerusalem for the purpose. Though originally intended to meet a want felt principally by the Jews of Alexandria, who were ignorant not only of Hebrew, but of the language which had superseded it in Palestine, and in which the Hebrew Scriptures were there explained to the people, the Septuagint, as Protestant writers admit,[1]

[1] Scaliger, Animad. in Euseb.: Walton, *Proleg.* ix. 15; Prideaux, *Connexion*, Part II., B. i., p. 40; Davidson, on *Septuag.*, Kitto's *Cycl.*

was soon spread abroad, and read by the Jews in the synagogues throughout Egypt, the whole of Asia, and Northern Africa. And while this was the case, these Jews were recognized as orthodox by their brethren in Jerusalem, as is evident from the letters addressed by the latter to their brethren in Egypt, and found in II. Mach., a book written, according to the best Protestant critics,[1] about 150 B. C. That this version was known to and tolerated, if not approved, by the highest ecclesiastical authority in Jerusalem, may be inferred from the fact that, as Adam Clarke, a learned Methodist minister, confesses in his *Commentary on Acts* vii. 14, St. Stephen quoted the Septuagint in his defence before the council at Jerusalem, without a word of reproof from his judges or accusers. Walton[2] goes even farther, declaring that "the authority of this version became so great.... even in the city of Jerusalem, that it was read publicly in the Synagogue;" that "Philo," a learned Jew of Alexandria, "and Josephus," a native of Jerusalem, a priest and a professed member of the strictest Jewish sect—the Pharisees—"quoted it" in their writings;[3] that "Josephus, *contra Apion.*, cited some passages from the deutero books;[4] that "the apostles and evangelists follow it in quoting the Scriptures, and in their writings, as it were, consecrated it;"[5] and that "the apostles delivered it to the Church, when by it they had subjugated the world to Christ."[6] Davidson asserts,[7] when speaking of the Septuagint, that Philo and Josephus adopted it; and it was universally received by the early Christians. Even the Talmud makes honorable mention of its origin." Prideaux, as notorious for his anti-Catholic prejudices, as he was re-

[1] Prideaux, *Con.*, Part II., B. iii., p. 127; Kitto's *Cycl.*, *II. Mach.*
[2] *Proleg.* ix. 2.
[3] Ibid. 15.
[4] Ibid. ix. 13.
[5] Ibid. 56.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Kitto's *Cycl.*, *Sept.*

markable for his literary industry, tells[1] his readers that "when the Septuagint was completed, the Jews of Alexandria had the stated lessons read out of it in their synagogues, and they had copies of it at home, for their own private use;"[2] although, as he correctly observes, afterwards, "as it grew into use among the Christians, it grew out of credit with the Jews,"[3] the reason being, that the latter were unable to answer the arguments based upon it by the advocates of the Christian religion, and at last, in the second century, substituted another Greek translation, prepared by Aquila, one of their own proselytes, and a renegade from Christianity. Stackhouse, also referring to the subject, remarks that of this kind of Jews (Hellenists), we are told, there were great numbers in Jerusalem, where there was a synagogue particularly appointed for such as understood no other language than Greek, and where the version of the LXX was constantly read in their assemblies."[4]

There is therefore enough and more than enough of testimony by the most respectable Protestant writers, to make it certain, that the only copy of the Scriptures in use among the Hellenists, wherever they found themselves, in or out of Palestine, from the third century B. C. to the second A. D., was the Septuagint. There is also at hand abundant testimony of the same character to prove, that those Jews who, whether at home or abroad, read and studied the Scriptures in this version, maintained not only friendly relations but religious communion with the ecclesiastical authorities at Jerusalem. In fact, this follows necessarily from the preceding testimony itself. For, the Septuagint could not have been "read publicly in the synagogue" at Jerusalem, nor would "a synagogue have been appointed" there

[1] *Con.*, Part II., B. i., 40.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid. 41.
[4] *Hist. of the Bible*, p. 1061.

for "the constant reading of the LXX" to or by those who "understood no other language than Greek," had not these Greek-speaking Jews, or Hellenists,[1] enjoyed religious fellowship with the people of Jerusalem, and those who there directed public worship or occupied the chair of Moses. For all Jews, abroad as well as at home, Jerusalem was a center of unity, and "all the Jews throughout the habitable earth, and those that worshipped God, nay, even those of Asia and Europe, sent their contributions to it, and this from ancient times."[2] The generosity displayed by Alexander, Alabarch at Alexandria, who manifested his piety as a Jew by enriching nine gates of the Temple at Jerusalem with silver and gold,[4] must have had many imitators among Jews of his class, everywhere. Indeed, Dr. Davidson has no hesitation in saying that "the Jews of Egypt looked upon Jerusalem as their city, and the Sanhedrim of Jerusalem as their ecclesiastical rulers."[5] It is true that Onias, the legitimate high priest, having been driven out of Jerusalem, had in the nome of Heliopolis in Egypt erected at Leontopolis a temple, in which religious worship was performed; and that the stricter Jews may have regarded the innovation as schismatical, at least in its tendency; yet even they appear to have extended to it a certain degree of toleration, while the bare mention of the temple at Garizim was certain to excite a feeling of contempt and horror in the soul of every orthodox Israelite. At any rate, as Professor Smith has said, speaking of the Hellenists, "there is not

[1] From *Hellenes*,—Greeks.

[2] Josephus, *Ant.*, B. xiv. c. vii. 3; B. xvi. c. vi. § 2–7; B. xviii. c. ix. § 1.

[3] Origin of this word doubtful; it is applied to the chief magistrate of the Jews at Alexandria, and though it may sometimes mean a tax collector, it is here probably synonymous with ethnarch, a deputy governor. As an apparent compound of *allos* and *arche*, it would seem to mean "a ruler of the foreign element in a population."

[4] Jos., *Wars*, B. v., c. v., § 3; *Ant.*, B. xx., c. v., § 2.

[5] Kitto's *Cyclop.*, *Septuagint.*

the slightest evidence that they were regarded as heretics, using an inferior Bible, or in any way falling short of all the requisites of true Judaism. . . . In the time of Christ there were many Hellenistic Jews in Jerusalem, with synagogues of their own, where the Greek version was in regular use .... Hellenists and Hebrews, the Septuagint and the original text, met at Jerusalem without schism or controversy. The divergencies of the Septuagint must have been patent to all Jerusalem, yet we find no attempt to condemn or suppress the version."[1] Elsewhere he tells us, "Josephus, though an orthodox Pharisee, makes use of the LXX, even where it departs from the Hebrew (I. Esdras)."[2] Any one, in fact, who reads what Josephus has written in Book XI., chapter iii., of his Antiquities, will find that he follows the account he found in III. Esdras, rather than that contained in the Hebrew I. Esdras. Is it not possible that the Historian meant to include III. Esdras instead of I. Esdras among "the twenty-two divine books," which he mentions, while writing against Apion?[3] This, however, by the way. For the point here under consideration has been fairly well proved, namely, that the Hellenists were recognized at Jerusalem as orthodox Jews. Indeed, to be convinced that such was the case, the reader need only consult the Acts of the Apostles ii., vi., ix.

But is there any reason for believing, that the copy of the Scriptures used by the Hellenists, thus clearly shown to have been in communion with the supreme religious authority at Jerusalem, included the deutero books? Yes, the very best of reasons, if conclusions derived from the admissions of learned Protestants, nay, even the positive statements of such critics to that effect,

[1] *The Old T. in the Jewish Church*, pp. 100, 101.

[2] Ibid. 402.

[3] B. i., § 8

can be appealed to as a proof of the fact. That there is such testimony at hand, the following references will place beyond doubt. Walton[1] tells his readers that "the apocryphal (as he calls the deutero) books, as they were the productions of different authors, were written at different times, some in Hebrew, some in Greek; and though they were first received by the Hellenists, nevertheless, when they were compacted into one volume cannot be precisely assigned. This, however, is clear, that the Church received them from the Hellenistic Jews." If the Hellenists were the first to receive these books, and the Church received them from the Hellenists, then certainly the latter, before and at the commencement of the Christian era at the latest, while recognized as consistent Jews at Jerusalem, had the deutero books in their copies of the Old Testament; and not only in those copies, but mixed among the proto books; not separated from them or added by way of an appendix, but inserted here and there as integral parts of one volume, just as they appear at present in all printed copies, and even in the most ancient manuscripts, as the Vatican, Alexandrian, Sinaitic, and Parcisian. And no unprejudiced reader, after examining one of these copies, could reach any other conclusion, than that in point of authority the deutero were considered in no way inferior to the proto books. Dr. Davidson[2] is therefore compelled to admit that "the very way in which apocryphal (so he calls the deutero) are inserted among canonical books in the Alexandrian version, shows the equal rank assigned to both." Throughout the East, as well as the West, all Bibles in the hands of Christians generally contained the deutero interspersed among the proto books, up till the sixteenth century. For it was not until 1526 that Lonicer, in his edition of the Septuagint, with sacrilegious hands separated the

[1] *Prolog.* ix. 13.

[2] *Encycl. Britt., Canon.*

deutero books from those in the Jewish canon. His example was soon followed by a countryman of congenial spirit, Martin Luther, who in his translation placed the deutero scriptures between the Old and New Testament. Indeed, Martin seems to have entertained this project as early as 1523, when he commenced the publication of his translation in parts. At all events, after his translation appeared, the arrangement which he has the credit of inventing, against the unanimous protest of Christian antiquity, was preserved generally in all Protestant Bibles till 1827, when the absolute exclusion of the deutero books from the Bible was decreed by the London Bible Society, after a long and acrimonious controversy with the branch societies, especially of the Scotch Kirk. This arbitrary decision was vehemently, but unsuccessfully, opposed by the continental societies and many prominent Protestant ministers. It is remarkable that from first to last not one among the disputants even seems to have suspected, that Esther should have been excluded with the other deutero books; for, whether the reader be guided by Jewish or Christian tradition, he will find that Esther's claim to proto canonicalness is no better than that of any among those books. The remark of Vossius is somewhat to the point, as tending to show that the Hebrew canon had by no means that fixed, definite character, with which it is so often credited. Having occasion to refer to the additions in the book of Esther, that writer says,[1] "Because that book in not a few places includes more in the Greek translation than in the Hebrew, it is commonly supposed that these additions have been made by the Greek interpreter. I, however, have a far different opinion, nor do I doubt but that the discrepancy in question resulted from the fact, that the Hebrews had two editions, one larger, the other smaller." These ad-

[1] Vincenzi, *Sessio quarta Conc. Trid.*, pars. ii., p. 35.

ditions were therefore, if Vossius be correct, not only in the Septuagint before it was adopted by the Christians, but even in the Hebrew Old Testament at the time it was translated into Greek, about or not long after 290 B. C. And might not the other deutero books, at least such of them as were then written, have been found at the same time on what was generally considered the roll of sacred Scriptures? But in that hypothesis, a by no means improbable one, since it is implied in the admission of Vossius, what becomes of the story about the Esdrine origin of the Old Testament canon?

Again, in deciding whether the Old Testament, as used by the Hellenists, included the deutero Scriptures, due attention should be paid to the contents of the Old Latin Vulgate or *Vetus Itala*, as it is sometimes called. It was, as all know, simply a Latin version of the Septuagint, made in the very infancy of the Church. "Some," says Walton,[1] "have not hesitated to refer it to a disciple of the apostles . . . . and though they assert this without authority, it is probable, nevertheless, that it was in use at the very commencement of the Church, since a Latin church could not be without a Latin version, and the Roman church, which has always held the chief place among the churches, and was most tenacious of ancient traditions, received that version into common use." Now let the reader turn to Kitto's Cyclopedia,[2] a Protestant work, and he will find that this remarkable Latin version contained all the deutero books. Then, if he asks how or whence did they get there, the only possible answer is, from the Septuagint. It follows, therefore, that when the Septuagint passed from the Hellenists to the Christians, that is, in the very origin of the Christian religion, it included the deutero Scriptures

[1] *Prolog.* x. i.

[2] *Vulgate*, pp. 922, 923.

among its other contents; that is, the Bible used by Hellenists before the commencement of the Christian era comprised not only the books now found on the Hebrew canon, but those others, which Jews and Protestants have rejected as apocryphal, but which the Church from the beginning has venerated equally with the rest as the word of God.

The remarks of Marsh (d. 1839), Anglican Bishop of Peterborough, on this subject, are as suggestive as they are candid. "The Council of Trent," says he,[1] "declared no other books to be sacred and canonical than such as had existed from the earliest ages of Christianity, not only in the Latin version of the Old Testament, but even in the ancient Greek version, which is known by the name of the Septuagint .... In the manuscript of the Septuagint there is the same intermixture of canonical and apocryphal (deutero) books, as in the manuscripts of the Latin version." It is added that "the ecclesiastical (deutero) books were generally written within a period which could not have extended to more than two centuries before the birth of Christ. In the choice of the places which were assigned them by the Greek Jews resident in Alexandria and other parts of Egypt, who probably added these books to the Septuagint, according as they became gradually approved of, they were directed partly by the subject, partly by their relations to other books, and partly by the periods in which the recorded transactions took place." After this, what further need is there of testimony, since these books were not only added to, but *approved*, and intermingled among the other books on the present Jewish canon by Jews who were admitted, as it appears, to full religious fellowship at Jerusalem.

But let us hear the evidence of one more Protestant witness, a comparatively recent writer, Rev. W. W.

[1] *Comparative View*, p. 89.

Wright, M. A., LL. D., of Trinity College, Dublin. "These books," says Dr. Wright, referring to the deutero, in an article contributed to Kitto's Cyclopedia on *Deuterocanonical*, "seem to have been included in the copies of the Septuagint, which was generally made use of by the sacred writers of the New Testament. It does not appear whether the apostles gave any cautions against the reading of these books, and it has even been supposed that they have referred to them." Then, after giving a list of some twenty passages found in the deutero books, and to which the writers of the New Testament are "supposed" to have "referred," Dr. Wright adds: "The only copies of the Scriptures in existence for the first three hundred years after Christ, either among the Jews or Christians of Greece, Italy, or Africa, contained these books without any mark of distinction that we know of."

Two points, therefore, are settled, so far as Protestant testimony can do it. First, the Septuagint containing the deutero books was the copy of the sacred Scriptures used publicly and privately by the Hellenistic Jews everywhere, for nearly three centuries before the time of Christ, and, indeed, for nearly two centuries after that. Second, while doing so, those Jews were in communion with the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem, and were there treated not only as members of the same race, but as genuine professors of the same religion. It is hardly necessary to say, that the first point is not only admitted but insisted on by every Catholic writer who has ever discussed the subject of the canon. Indeed, it would be easy to show that these same Catholic writers who argue that there was up till the time of Christ but one canon, the Palestinian, contend that the Septuagint contained the deutero books, and that these, though not before that canonized, were highly venerated by the Jews. In proof of this it is quite snfficient to appeal to

Huet [1] and Ubaldi,[2] both of whom contend that until the time of Christ the only canon was the Palestinian. The second point is not only conceded, but insisted on by Catholic critics. Jahn maintains "that the Jews, wherever found throughout the world, constituted one society, having as a bond of union the temple of Jerusalem, to which they sent every year half a shekel, and to which on feast days all came who could, while those who could not, sent gifts and sacrifices to be offered there. Even this bond of union was maintained by the Egyptian Jews, who had a temple at Leontopolis, and who, nevertheless, visited not rarely the Temple at Jerusalem."[3] Vincenzi[4] declares, that "the Egyptian Jews, though a temple was erected at Leontopolis, did not fail to observe the duties of their religion, or to live in concord with their Palestinian brethren;" and argues from the prologue to Ecclesiasticus, the epistle *Purim* in the Book of Esther, the visit of the seventy-two Elders of Judea to Egypt to translate the Hebrew Scripture for Ptolemy, and from II. Mach. i., that "the Alexandrian Jews maintained with those of Jerusalem fellowship and unity in the observance of the laws." Ubaldi[5] points to Esther xi. 1, etc., and II. Mach. i., as proof that "perfect communion, mutual prayers, communication of feasts, delivery of sacred books, prevailed between the two classes of Jews," those of Palestine and those of Alexandria. Even Huet,[6] whose theory has found such a learned advocate in Ubaldi, while citing the words contained in II. Mach. ii., recognizes the fact, that "the Hellenists, to whom these words were written, consulted the Synagogue of Jerusalem

[1] *Demonst. Evang.*, p. 344.
[2] *Introd. in S. Script.*, vol. ii., 187.
[3] Migne, *Script. Cursus*, Tom. ii., col. 1009, 1014.
[4] *Sessio Quarta Conc. Trid.*, Pars. ii., pp. 25, 26.
[5] *Introd. in S. Scrip.*, vol. ii., 192.
[6] *Demonst. Evang.*, p. 344.

about divine things, and followed its decrees." In fact, those who with Huet believe that the Jews, whether Palestinian or Hellenistic, never had any canon but the Palestinian, insist on the close communion between the two classes of Jews as an argument in favor of their theory, alleging that, as it is certain that there was a Palestinian canon identical with the existing Hebrew canon, according to Josephus and the tradition of the Jews, the Hellenists, as being in communion with the central authority at Jerusalem, could not have had a different one; and therefore, that the existence of an Alexandrian canon, different from the one followed in Judea, is contradicted by well established facts. Here it may be observed, by the way, that in the present enquiry facts are exceedingly rare, and those just mentioned, when punctured, would probably collapse into conjectures. But Cornely[1] meets this argument of the Huet School in the following manner: The communion admitted to exist between the Palestinians and Hellenists did not prevent the latter, especially such of them as lived in Egypt, from performing the most solemn acts of religion in the temple of Leontopolis, although to do so was positively forbidden by the Law of Moses.[2] Then, why might they not, without rupturing the religious bond which connected them with Jerusalem, adopt a few books in addition to those revered as sacred by their Palestinian brothers; for, in doing so they violated no part of the Mosaic Law. This was clear; but it was not so clear that the erection of a temple at Leontopolis was not an infraction of that Law. In fact, as will be seen hereafter,[3] Rabbins writing, however, long after the final dispersion of the Jews, have declared that priests who had officiated in the temple of Onias were not permitted to offer in the Temple of Jerusalem.

[1] *Introd. in S. Scrip.*, vol. i., p. 53.

[2] Deut. xii.

[3] p. 105.

At all events, if the unanimous verdict of Catholic and Protestant critics be worth anything, it is certain that the Hellenists used a copy of the Scriptures containing the deutero books, and were nevertheless considered entitled to all the privileges accorded to the most orthodox Jews. In other words, they were admitted to full spiritual fellowship by the ecclesiastical authorities at Jerusalem, were there allowed to take part in the public worship at the Temple, to present their offerings, to perform their sacrifices, to frequent their own synagogue, and there listen to the reading of the Alexandrian version with a degree of license as ample as that under which the native Jews assembled to hear the Scriptures read in their mother tongue. And all this, while both at Jesusalem and elsewhere these Hellenists learned and read privately and publicly the Scriptures, not in Hebrew or Aramaic, but in Greek, and that in a translation whose contents had been so arranged as to ignore any distinction between the writings of Solomon and the compositions of the Son of Sirach, and obliterate all difference between the documents that contained the history of the kings who ruled over Juda and Israel, and those which recorded the brave deeds of the Machabean patriots. This, too, although Ecclesiasticus, Machabees, and some other books in the translation were, if the Rabbins and their Christian pupils are to be believed, ranked by the spiritual authorities at Jerusalem, among those profane productions which never had been, and never could be honored by a place in that sacred roll which constituted their canon of Scripture. All this, in view of the rigid principles that regulated the conduct of the Palestinian Jews, in whatever concerned religious belief and practice, is not only marvellous but inexplicable; unless it be supposed that the Jews at that time had no fixed canon, or if they had, that the deutero books were then included in it.

Moreover, it is well known that, besides the canonical books, the Jews possessed many others, to some of which allusion is made in the Old Testament; of these others all—a few excepted—have perished. It cannot be doubted, that among all those books were writings equal in authority to those that survived, and writings, too, on whose character it would be hard to pass judgment, and writings, besides, which, when examined, would have at once betrayed their human origin. But are we to believe that there was no means provided for separating the tares and the chaff from the good grain in this undigested mass of literature; that all who were able to read could satisfy their thirst for knowledge, by possessing such portions of the whole collection as choice or accident placed in their hands, without any one to guide them in making a selection; and that, when the only sanction for insisting on the purity of public and private morals, for duly performing the sacred functions of religion, and for maintaining the civil and ecclesiastical polity of the theocracy, was derived from written records, and that sanction itself was universally recognized as divine, there was no way by which it could be decided, which of these records themselves were divine and which human? To ask such a question is to expose its absurdity; especially since the Jews, as will be shown, had always at hand, from the time of Moses until the coming of Christ, a tribunal divinely constituted for the purpose of deciding all doubts and disputes referring to religious belief or practice, and, of course, for the further purpose of distinguishing between scripture and scripture; so that all who cared, might, whenever a book appeared, know whether it had God or man for its author.

With these considerations before us, it would, therefore, seem unreasonable to doubt, that from the time of Moses until the coming of Christ the Jews had a canon; that

that canon, as soon as the Alexandrian version was generally adopted by the Hellenists, contained the deutero books; and that these books remained therein with the common consent and approval of all Jews, who, however, compelled by stress of controversy, decided, probably soon after the commencement of the Christian era, on rejecting them as uncanonical.[1] For this view considerable evidence has been produced already, and more will be submitted as the discussion proceeds.

[1] In order to meet the arguments by which it was proved that Christ was the Messiah, the Rabbins were forced to eliminate from their canon such of the deutero books as the Christians cited in behalf of that dogma; for example, the Book of Wisdom. This, however, the Rabbins could not consistently do, without also excluding the other deutero books which, like "Wisdom," were either not written in Hebrew, or even not written until long after inspiration had ceased—the age of Esdras—as they arbitrarily declared. Grant them all this, and it at least follows, as a necessary consequence, that the New Testament cannot have had God for its author. The Reformers accepted the rabbinical premises; but as their position compelled them to ignore every rule of logic, they, with characteristic inconsistency, rejected the conclusion to which these premises inevitably lead.

CHAPTER VI.

THE JEWISH CANON, THE WORK OF THE JEWISH HIGH PRIEST.

To return to Esdras: if the question concerning the origin of the Old Testament canon be decided, as it ought to be, by the Scriptures themselves so far as that is possible, and not by a rabbinical tradition so recent as compared with its subject, and so fabulous in many of its details as to be absolutely incredible, the honor of having been the first and the only one to draw up a canon does not belong to him. For it was Moses who laid the foundation of the canon, by directing that the Tables of the Law [1] should be deposited in, and Deuteronomy [2] beside, the ark of the covenant. Neither can the credit of having continued or completed the canon be claimed for Esdras. For while, according to the Scripture, Jeremias and Nehemias had something to do in its extension, Judas the Essene is entitled to the glory of having completed it. So, at least, it is said (as already remarked) by many interpreters. Thus, while all that the Scriptures have to say about the labors of Esdras on their contents is that "the children of Israel.... spoke to Esdras the Scribe to bring the Book of the Law of Moses," and he did so; "and he read it plainly in the street that was before the water gate, from the morning until mid-day:" [3] these same Scriptures speak of the "descriptions of Jeremias the prophet;" how "he gave charge to them that were carried away into captivity;"

[1] Ex. xxv. 16. [2] Deut. xxxi. 26. [3] Neh. viii. 1, 2, 3.

how "he gave them the law, that they should not forget the commandments of the Lord, and that they should not err in their minds .... and with other such like speeches exhorted them that they would not remove the law from their heart. It was also contained in the same writing how the Prophet," etc.[1] These same Scriptures also make mention of "the memoires and commentaries of Nehemias, and how he made a library, and gathered together out of the countries the books both of the Prophets, and of David, and the epistles of the Kings, and concerning the holy gifts."[2] This looks like the work which the author of a canon would have to do. And finally, these same Scriptures declare, that "Judas also gathered together all such things as were lost by the war."[3] These things were evidently such records as Nehemias in the preceding verse is said to have corrected. Now, is it not more reasonable (it may be, indeed, it has been said) to conclude on such scriptural testimony, that Moses laid the foundation of a canon, that it was continued by Jeremias and Nehemias, and at last brought to completion by Judas the Essene, "a prophet who never missed the truth in his predictions,"[4] than to argue, on the strength of a rabbinical legend unrecorded and unknown for several centuries after the supposed fact with which it deals must have occurred, that the formation of the canon is either partially or principally the work of Esdras? This question would elicit undoubtedly an affirmative answer from many modern critics. But there is among them quite a large number still, whose studies as well as respect for a theory, venerable at least for its antiquity, would induce them to protest against even the suspicion that suggests such a question. Moreover, it must be admitted, that, while the silence of the Scripture, as well as the very questionable

[1] II. Mach. ii. 1,—4.

[2] Ibid. 13.

[3] Ibid. 14.

[4] Josephus, *Antiq.*, B. xiii., c. xi., § 2.

character of the Jewish tradition, must forever render it exceedingly doubtful whether Esdras is entitled to any credit as the principal author of the canon, the opinion that Jeremias, or Nehemias, or Judas the Essene contributed to make the Jewish canon what it is, deserves hardly any consideration, as it rests on nothing better than a forced construction put upon a few texts of Scripture.

In view, however, of the fact, that the law of Moses conferred on the High Priest plenary authority to render a definitive judgment in all controversies that were brought before him, it is quite unnecessary, nay, unscriptural, to look beyond the latter venerable personage for the author of the canon, whatever may be the books of which it is composed. In fact, to do so is to disregard the plain sense of the Scripture, and engage in an inquiry which the experience of centuries shows must be conducted on purely conjectural grounds, and can therefore lead to no certain nor even probable result. That law ordained, that, when among the children of Israel there should arise "a hard and doubtful *matter* in judgment between blood and blood, cause and cause, leprosy and leprosy," and when it should happen "that the words of the judges within thy gates do vary," then the litigants were to "go up to the place which the Lord thy God shall choose. And . . . . come to the priests of the Levitical race, and to the judge that shall be at that time; and shall ask of them, and they shall show the truth of the judgment." And the litigants were further directed to "do whatsoever they shall say that preside in the place which the Lord shall choose, and what they shall teach. . . According to his law;" and it was further ordered that all should "follow their sentence," and "neither . . . . decline to the right hand nor to the left hand." Finally, it was decreed that whosoever "will be proud, and refuse to

obey the commandment of the priest who ministereth at that time to the Lord thy God, and the decree of the judge, that man shall die," and all are commanded thus to "take away the evil from Israel."[1]

The powers conferred on the High Priest by this ordinance are so ample, that, no matter how it may be interpreted, it seems impossible, so long as the plain obvious sense of the words in which it is couched is attended to, to reach any other conclusion, than that the High Priest was infallible in his official decisions. Indeed, it would be easy to prove this; and easy, too, to show that all the texts cited to the contrary by those critics who claim infallibility each for himself, but will not allow it even in God's anointed Supreme Pontiff, go to demonstrate, not that the Jewish High Priest was not infallible, but that he was not impeccable.[2] The question, however, is one which can only be alluded to here incidentally, as it is outside the range of the present discussion. For the purpose of that discussion it is enough to know, that God through his servant Moses directed that the jurisdiction of the High Priest should be supreme, and his decision final in all matters pertaining to religion. And what matters pertaining to the Jewish religion could be of more importance to all than the general estimate to be placed on those writings which either actually contained, or falsely professed to contain, the sanctions and credentials on which that religion based its claims to universal respect and obedience? That the Jews believed there were among them two classes of books, divine and human, is proved by the fact that at last, but too late for their decision to be of any account, they approved some books and condemned others. Who, throughout their entire history, from the commencement of their literature until the close of their national existence, was to draw the line of distinction between

[1] Deut. xvii. 8–12. [2] Becanus, *Analogy of the Scrip.*, ch. xi.

the two classes of compositions?' For that line of distinction had to be drawn on account of the reasons alleged above.[1] Not the scribes, as there is nothing said about them before the time of David. No, nor the prophets. For, although references to them are quite frequent in all parts of the Scripture, there is nothing of a judicial nature in their office. Besides, in the fundamental law, or divine constitution, under which the Jews lived, there is not a single ordinanee intimating in any way that the right to decide what was or was not divine Scripture belonged to scribe or prophet. There is only one man to whom, according to that constitution, such prerogative belonged, as inherent in his office, and that man was the High Priest for the time being.

That authority to place, from time to time, on the same list with the books composing the Pentateuch such other compositions as he might consider written under similar influence, was given to the High Priest, there can therefore be no doubt; as is evident, not only from the ordinance of Moses cited above, but from the preceding as well as the following considerations.

The discovery made by Helcias,[2] when he found in the Temple what was probably the very Law as written by Moses, or at least what was then apparently a rare copy of it, may seem altogether irrelevant in the present discussion. But let the reader have the patience to examine the account as a critic, then say what he thinks. Here are the facts. Helcias was High Priest. His profound veneration for the volume which, consciously or otherwise, he had rescued from the secure obscurity to which, in order to preserve it from profanation, himself or a predecessor had consigned it, is quite apparent. He recognizes it at once, long reading and careful study of its contents having, of course, enabled him to identify it without any difficulty. But perhaps the volume was

[1] Supra p. 85. [2] IV. Kings xxii. 8; II. Paral. xxxiv. 14.

gotten up for the occasion? An infidel might say so. But Saphan the Scribe, and Josias the King, and Ahicam, and Achabor, and Asaia, and Holda the Prophetess, and all the ancients of Juda and Jerusalem, and all the priests and prophets, (including, very likely, Sophonias and even Jeremias,) and all the people both great and little, as the Scripture asserts, thought otherwise, and unhesitatingly received the volume as "the Book of the Law of the Lord by the hand of Moses." But why? Because the High Priest had so declared; and because they knew that Moses had appointed the High Priest to pronounce a definitive judgment between Scripture and Scripture, as well as between leprosy and leprosy, and that death was the penalty of disobeying that judgment. Although some commentators are of a different opinion, it is difficult to understand how the book could have been even a copy of the original, and not the very autograph of Moses himself. Josias, the King, is surprised, in fact terrified, while hearing it read. Had he never before heard the fearful judgments pronounced by Moses against those, who transgressed the Law of the Lord? Had he already been engaged six [1] years in a constant effort to extirpate idolatry in his kingdom and even beyond its limits, without having read or heard read the only written law which justified his proceedings? No, that cannot be supposed. The monarch was troubled and alarmed, not by what was read, but by the belief that he was listening to the appalling denunciations of crime not only in the very words which he had often read and heard before, but in the very words which Moses had traced with his own pen, and in the very volume in which Moses had written them, some eight hundred years before. An aged volume, undoubtedly, but only about half as old as some volumes (the Vatican copy of the Septuagint, for example) preserved among Christians,

[1] II. Paral. xxxiv. 3, 8.

whose care of the Scriptures is certainly not greater than that taken of them by the Jews. Whether the book which excited the consternation of Josias was the original or a copy, is, however, a matter of no consequence. It was duly authenticated as genuine, and practically declared the essential germ, of which the future canon was to be the natural outgrowth. But authenticated and declared by whom? By the High Priest, whose judgment in the case was accepted as final, not only by all scribes, prophets, and Jews then and subsequently, but by Christians in every age. It is useless to argue with any one who cannot find in the inspired account of this remarkable affair prima facie evidence, that it was the prerogative of the High Priest to decide, whether, as books appeared, they were canonical or apocryphal, divine or human.

No doubt, the plenary powers with which the High Priest was invested by Moses, in all matters pertaining to religion, were too often ignored and practically disregarded by the Jews and their rulers. But so, too, occasionally were the plainest and gravest duties prescribed by the law. Yet, as no one concludes that a duty is no longer binding because it is sometimes violated, so it will not do to say that the powers placed in the hands of the High Priest—rather claimed for him in the present discussion for reasons already assigned—were either not given, or if given had ceased; because, so far as known, they were exercised but rarely, or because many instances might be cited in which their enforcement in other matters besides the Scripture—a subject in the treatment of which the Jewish Pontiff seems to have long enjoyed the utmost liberty—was not admitted or was violently suspended by the disturbed state of the theocracy, or by the arbitrary will of the petty despots who usurped supreme power in Church as well as State. Yet even these despots hardly ever ap-

peared disposed to interfere in the exercise of the power inherent in the Jewish Pontificate, unless when such exercise seemed likely to frustrate their own ambitious designs; while those pious princes who sought the will of God and the happiness of their subjects, fostered rather than curbed the powers placed in the custody of the high Priest. Of this we have an example in the history of Josaphat, King of Juda, who preceded Josias by about two hundred years. This virtuous prince, anxious to correct evils resulting from the policy of his wicked predecessors, undertook a reformation in the civil and ecclesiastical affairs of his kingdom, his intention being to re-organize both as far as possible according to the constitution which Moses had traced. Among the arrangements which he introduced, or rather the Mosaic institutions which he restored, was the Pontificate as created and outlined in Deuteronomy. For, addressing the priestly class, he says: "And Amarias the Priest, your High Priest, shall be chief in the things which regard God."[1] Now, say, is there anything which regards God more than controversies about the canon of Scripture, that is, disputes about what God has or has not written? And, in fact, it seems that it was principally religious controversies of all kinds, including, of course, such as referred to the Scriptures, with which the priests were occupied. And therefore Ezechiel, treating of their rights and duties, says: "When there shall be controversy, they shall stand in my judgment, and shall judge."[2] And of these priests, the High Priest was chief. As such he was supreme judge, the others ranking as assessors or counsellors. To his action as supreme judge, or president in the last court of appeal, no opposition was probably offered by the civil power, unless when that action was likely to thwart the will of the temporal ruler. And as questions regarding

[1] II. Paral. xix. 11.

[2] Ez. xliv. 24.

the canonicity of writings, whatever might be the decision, were not likely to excite the fears or interfere with the projects of that ruler, the High Priest, in taking cognizance of such cases, was, it may be supposed, free to give judgment according to his own honest convictions, while, when the temporal sovereignty and spiritual supremacy were, as often happened after the captivity, united in him, he enjoyed a degree of liberty which, even apart from the divine sanction, on which, according to popular belief, his authority was based, must have gone far in securing for his decisions universal confidence and respect. The view here advocated is further confirmed by Josephus, who, while sketching the constitution drawn up by Moses, says that there were to "be seven men to judge in every city," each judge being allotted "two ministers . . . . out of the tribe of Levi." . . . . But if these judges be unable to give a just sentence . . . . let them send the cause undetermined to the holy city, and let the High Priest and the Prophet and the Sanhedrim, after meeting together, determine as it shall seem good to them." [1] This was evidently a court in which the High Priest acted as supreme judge. Elsewhere [2] Josephus, discussing the same subject, states, that the constitution under which the Jews lived "permits the priests in general to be the administrators of the principal affairs, and withal intrusts the government over the other priests to the chief priest. . . . These men had the main care of the law and of the other parts of the people's conduct committed to them; for they were the priests who were ordained to be the inspectors of all, and the judges of doubtful cases." And "His [God's] priests are to be continually about His worship, over whom he that is the first by birth is to be their ruler perpetually. His business must be to offer sacrifices to God, together with those priests who are joined with him, to see that the

[1] *Antiq.*, B. iv., c. 8, 14. [2] B. II. *Contra Apion*, § 22.

laws be observed, to determine controversies."[1] This is clear, to the point, and decisive. It is, therefore, evident, that the right to determine what books were divine, and therefore to be placed on the canon, belonged to the High Priest; and that, when in this or any other question, concerning religious belief or practice especially, controversies arose that could not be otherwise settled, they were finally and definitively decided by a judicial sentence, pronounced or approved by him. Thus it seems that God had appointed the same means for establishing a canon of Scripture and securing unity of faith in the Old Dispensation, as He was pleased to sanction for the same purposes in the New.

Engaged, as we are, in examining what were the relations of the High Priest to the Sacred Scriptures, and what he had to do with the Old Testament, before its custody was usurped by scribes and Rabbins, it seems quite in order to inquire, whether and to what extent he was supposed by the Jews to have been concerned in the production of the LXX. To review the history of that celebrated version, as it has been told by Jewish writers, Aristeas, Aristobulus, Philo, Josephus, and after them some of the Christian Fathers, is outside the scope of the present work. The reader is supposed to know, that modern criticism has very generally rejected many of the details comprised in that history, though it has to admit the main facts, around which these details have been grouped—that the Hebrew Scriptures were translated into Greek nearly three centuries before Christ, several books written originally in Greek having been added to the collection then or soon after, and that that translation was the work of several Jews, Palestinian or Egyptian, possibly both.

These facts are all fully proved, not only by the existence of the translation itself, which, ever since it was

[1] Jos. *Contra Apion.*, B. ii. § 24.

made, has been well known to Jews, to Gentiles, and from the day of Pentecost to Christians wherever found, but especially by the unanimous testimony of the Jewish writers named above. As, however, that testimony is about to be appealed to for another purpose, it seems proper, in the first place, to state what is known about these writers.

Aristeas, who, according to his own statement, lived in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, 284–246 B. C., and was an officer in the body guard of that monarch, is the first writer to refer to the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, an undertaking in the promotion of which, according to his own account, he himself took an active part. That account is contained in a letter still extant, addressed to his brother Polycrates. In that letter, the only document claiming Aristeas as its author, the writer describes in considable detail the various steps taken by command of Ptolemy Philadelphus, as advised by his librarian Demetrius Phalereus, in order to obtain a Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures for the library already founded by Ptolemy at Alexandria. Throughout his letter Aristeas writes as if he were a pagan. But the knowledge which he therein displays of Jewish laws, customs, and rites, as well as the great interest he took in improving the condition of the Jews in Egypt, fully warrant the conjecture that he himself belonged to the same race.

Aristobulus, the first after Aristeas to mention the Greek translation, was, according to Eusebius, a Jew and a peripatetic philosopher. He is also said to have been preceptor to Ptolemy Philometer, who succeeded to the throne of Egypt in 175 B. C., and to have written a commentary on the five Books of Moses. This commentary, which he dedicated to his royal pupil, has long since perished, and all that remains of it are a few

brief extracts preserved in the writings of Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius. From the extract made by Clement [1] it appears that, according to Aristobulus, while referring to the writing of the LXX as suggested by Demetrius Phalereus, a Greek translation of at least a part of the Hebrew Scriptures had been made before the reign of Alexander and the Persians. The extract preserved by Eusebius [2] agrees substantially with this. For, as represented by Eusebius, Aristobulus expressed himself thus: "For even before Demetrius Phalereus, and even long before the reign of Alexander and the Persians, all the Hebrew writings had been translated into Greek." It is thus seen that the writing of the Septuagint is mentioned at least incidentally by Aristobulus, who refers it to the period designated in the letter of Aristeas. The former, however, beyond this meagre allusion to the enterprise which secured to the Jews of Egypt a copy of the Scriptures in their vernacular, gives not a single detail connected with the affair. He was a prominent Jewish priest, for it can hardly be doubted that he is the same person named in II. Mach. i. 10., and one may well believe, that in his writings, which, with the exceptions above referred to, have all been lost, he gave a detailed account of the origin of that Greek version of the Hebrew Scriptures, so long and so justly prized by all of his race in Egypt and other countries where Greek was understood.

Philo Judæus, a Platonic philosopher, already noticed in these pages, a native of Alexandria, who flourished in the first Christian century, and a Jewish priest according to St. Jerome, [3] in his account of the Septuagint, gives [4] some particulars omitted in that of Aristeas.

Josephus in his statements [5] agrees generally with

[1] *Strom.* v. 1., c. xxii. [2] *Prepar. Ev.*, l. xiii., c. xii. [3] *De Viris Illust.* c. xi. [4] *De Vita Moysis* l. ii. [5] *Antiq.* B. xii., c. ii.

what is told us by Aristeas about the origin of the LXX.

To argue in support of the proposition at the head of this chapter, regarding the relation of the High Priest to the canon of Scripture, by appealing also to the authority of the Jewish writers who have described the origin of the LXX, will probably be a surprise to some critics. No credit, it will be said, should be given to what these writers have stated. Have they not been convicted of gross exaggeration, if not positive falsehood? Besides, if all their statements were true, not one word that they have said has any bearing on the question at issue. Patience, kind reader. Those writers were all Jews, one, if not three, certainly belonging to the priesthood, and he a member of the strictest Jewish sect. All they have told us has been told with the feelings, traditions, and convictions of Jews; therefore, though the account they have given us may be false in many and even important particulars, credit must be given them for truthfully stating what steps, they believed, must have been taken, in initiating and carrying through the undertaking which they describe. Passing by, therefore, all they tell us about what Demetrius Phalereus did in founding a library at Alexandria under the auspices of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and the liberal measures adopted by the latter for improving the condition of the Jews in Egypt, let us see what these Jewish writers say was done, rather what they believed should have been done, in order to secure competent translators and a correct copy of the Hebrew Scriptures: for without both a reliable translation in Greek, such as Ptolemy desired and the Egyptian Jews required, could not be expected. Translators and Hebrew copies of the Scriptures might indeed have been easily obtained among the Jews who were then settled in Egypt. For it cannot be supposed, that there were not in Egypt at that time several Jews familiar with Hebrew and Greek, and possessing copies of the Hebrew Scriptures. Many of their forefathers,

while captives in Babylon, are known to have understood Chaldee, while retaining the use of their mother tongue and the sacred records written in that tongue. And in these respects the condition of the Jews in Babylon could not have been more favorable than that of their descendants under Ptolemy Philadelphus in Egypt.

But evidently, according to the belief of those Jews who have given an account of the first known attempt at translating the Hebrew Scriptures, linguists possessing the necessary qualifications for that task, and an authentic copy of these Scriptures for their use while engaged thereon, were to be obtained only at Jerusalem, and from no one there but the High Priest. For this reason the reader is informed, that an embassy, in which Aristeas took part, was commissioned by Ptolemy to proceed to Jerusalem and there obtain from the High Priest whatever was necessary for the contemplated translation. About the embassy there can be no doubt. It is mentioned and described by Aristeas, Philo, and Josephus. Even Humphrey Hody, who considers the account of Aristeas fabulous, and, had the Septuagint perished before his own time, would probably have denied that such a version ever existed, admits [1] that the Palestinian and Hellenistic Jews all believed that Ptolemy Philadelphus did really send an embassy to the High Priest for a copy of the Hebrew Scriptures and Jewish scholars to translate them into Greek. Nor is this all; for, as Calmet [2] has observed, Joseph ben Gorion, a Jewish writer supposed to have lived in the ninth century of our era, states that the High Priest, whose name he does not give, sent 70 elders, among whom was Eleazar,[3] who was cruelly put to death under Antiochus Epiphanes. And furthermore, the Samaritans, always ready to claim a share in every measure that redounded

[1] *De Bibl. Text*, 137, 220.

[2] *Dissert. de Vers. Sept. Interp.*

[3] II. Mach. vi.

to the credit of the Jews, assert in their chronicle, or book of Josue as it is also called, that Philadelphus sent for their High Priest Aaron with the most eminent men of their community; and also sent for Eleazar, the High Priest of the Jews, with their most learned doctors, in order that each party might make a Greek translation of the divine Law. And when the two translations were found to differ in some places, the king approved the version of the Samaritans, whom he honored with valuable gifts, forbidding at the same time the Jews even to set foot on the sacred mount of Garizim.[1]

The Jewish High Priest, according to our three Jewish witnesses, being informed of the wishes of Ptolemy, and no doubt of the urgent necessity felt by the Egyptian Jews for the Scriptures in the only language, probably, which most of them understood, appointed competent interpreters, whom he despatched to Alexandria with a copy of the Scriptures, selected by himself, which copy the interpreters were to translate into Greek. When the interpreters had completed their task, it was found to have been so faithfully executed, that the version received the unqualified approval of Ptolemy, was deposited in his library, and long served as a standard for those copies of the Scriptures which were used by all those Jews in Egypt and elsewhere who understood Greek alone, or who preferred to study their inspired records in that language.

The interpreters, having been royally entertained and rewarded for their labors, were allowed to return home, where, of course, they gave a report of all they had done to the High Priest, who may be supposed to have honored with his sanction the version they had written in Alexandria, though the account is silent on this point. That, however, is immaterial. The work done, to have been done right, should, as the Jewish writers believed, have been done by the duly accredited agents of the

[1] Calmet, *Dissert. de Vers. Sept. Interp.*

High Priest. And as it was done by them, it was really his work. He never protested against or condemned it. So, whatever may have become of it afterwards, and whether well or ill founded the objections which in the course of time the Jews made to it, the LXX, when it first came before the public, was, it may be said, stamped with the *Imprimatur* of their High Priest Eleazar, from whom Ptolemy is reported to have obtained the interpreters as well as the Hebrew copy on which they worked.

Let the reader bear in mind, that in what is here said there is no intention to maintain that the affair was conducted as the Jewish writers have stated, but simply to insist on the course which they believed must have been followed to bring such an enterprise to a satisfactory conclusion. These writers were evidently of the opinion that, when a translation of the Scriptures was needed, the High-Priest was the only person who could be approached on the subject, as it belonged to him to appoint the interpreters and select a copy from which a version was to be made. By the very fact that he selected a particular copy, it follows that he authenticated that copy, and that that copy was to be received as genuine by the interpreters and all those in whose interests the Greek version was written, pagans as well as Jews. In other words, the Jewish historians of the LXX believed that that version, in order to be what was expected, a veritable equivalent in Greek for the Hebrew Scriptures, must have been made from a Hebrew copy containing books whose canonicity then and there was officially declared by the very act of the High Priest, or, if so declared already by one of his predecessors, officially recognized by that act. Now, as it is not unreasonable to suppose that these historians fairly represented the general sentiment of the Jews at the time (indeed we have seen that such was the case), it proves that the Jews then commonly believed

that it was the exclusive right of the High Priest, in addition to other questions which came within his jurisdiction, to decide as supreme judge what books were or were not to be received as canonical. This right, of course, he must have exercised, not only after maturely considering the question himself, but after consulting such others within reach—priests, prophets, sanhedrim, (if such body existed), all, in fine, whom he supposed qualified to give advice in the case.

Again, at the time the Alexandrian version was made, the Jews whose homes were in Egypt were united in the closest bonds of religious communion with those Jews who lived in Palestine. Egyptians and Palestinians—the principal, it may be said, the only two classes of Jews at the time, in fact, differed only in language and country, so far as is now known. They worshipped in the same Temple—that of Jerusalem, professed the same belief, practised the same ceremonies, observed the same feasts, and, as all admit, had at that time the same sacred books. Now, therefore, as those of Egypt, according to the testimony of their own writers, (for two out of the three named above belonged to that country), believed that it was the prerogative of the High Priest to decide whether a book was canonical or not, it is not to be supposed that the Jews of Palestine thought otherwise: even were we unable to cite in proof of a common belief on the point the evidence of Josephus, one of themselves. For in a little more than a century afterwards, Onias, whose right to the chief priesthood was incontestable, but who, instead of being allowed to occupy that dignity peaceably, was compelled to seek a refuge in Egypt, succeeded in erecting there a temple, with the permission of Ptolemy Philometer. It was modelled after the temple of Jerusalem, and was served by priests and Levites, Onias himself being High Priest.[1] As a religious centre for the Jews residing in Egypt

[1] Jos., *Antiq.*, B. xiii., c.iii., § 1–3; *Wars*, B. i., c. i., § 1; B. vii., c. x., § 2. 3.

it seems to have filled an important purpose for many years, until further access to it was forbidden the Jews, and, its doors having been closed by an imperial decree in the reign of Vespasian,[1] it disappeared from history. In the service of that temple the Septuagint, then by no means a rare or a new book, but the only copy of the Scriptures which the worshippers understood, must have had a conspicuous place, while those worshippers continued to send, as we have seen, contributions to, and to offer sacrifice in the Temple of Jerusalem, maintaining all the time religious communion with their brethren there. Prideaux,[2] however, asserts that no Jew outside of Egypt "acknowledged the temple in Egypt at all, or any other but that of Jerusalem only, but looked on all those as schismatics that sacrificed anywhere else." For this statement he offers no proof, and although the Law of Moses directed that sacrifice should be nowhere offered "but in the place which the Lord shall choose,"[3] it has already been shown by the testimony of Josephus[4] that offerings for the temple of Jerusalem were received from the Jews of Egypt as well as everywhere else,[5] which would not have been the case had these Egyptian Jews been considered schismatics, or even in any way unworthy of recognition by those who had the right to pronounce judgment on the orthodoxy of all who professed to follow the Law of Moses. The Samaritan Jews professed to follow that law. In fact, it was the only part of the Old Testament that they retained or cared to possess. They also had a priest-

[1] Joseph., *Wars*, B. vii., c. x., § 4.

[2] *Connex.* vol. ii. 128. [3] Deut. xii. 11. [4] Supra, p. 75.

[5] It appears from a remarkable statement of Cicero, in his defense of Lucius Flaccus, that annual contributions flowed into the treasury of the temple at Jerusalem from Italy and all the provinces of the empire—being the pious tribute paid to their religion by the Jews then found in almost every country. To such a degree was this lavish expenditure carried, that, lest the resources of the provinces might be exhausted, it was found necessary in some instances to issue edicts against the practice.

hood of the Aaronic stock, but they neither sacrificed in nor made offerings to the temple of Jerusalem; they were not even tolerated there, nor was any gift at their hands received there, because they were considered schismatics; and the Jews of Egypt, had they been regarded in the same light, would have been treated in the same way. But it is not to be denied, that the temple of Onias may have been regarded with no favor by the zealots at Jerusalem. In fact, Jost, a German Jew writing in the present century, affirmed that in the older Mishna it is said: "Priests who have officiated in the temple of Onias cannot officiate in Jerusalem; they are looked upon as priests who have infirmities; they may participate and eat of the offerings, but cannot offer." [1] Not a single hint, however, to this effect is found in any work written while the temple of Onias was standing. On the contrary, it appears from II. Machabees, that fraternal intercourse with the Jews of Egypt was assiduously cultivated by the Jews of Jerusalem, and even Josephus, though he frequently refers to Onias, his priests, temple, and the manner in which it was fitted up, insinuates by no word that those who officiated there were judged unworthy to officiate at Jerusalem. Besides, both temples had disappeared long before the oldest writers of the Mishna could have known by actual experience how the priests belonging to one were treated in the other.

In view, therefore, of the divine ordinance defining the prerogatives of the High-Priest—in view of the inspired statements subsequently made in relation to that point—in view of the belief implied in the account given by several Jewish writers regarding the means employed for preparing a Greek version of the Hebrew Scriptures—and in view of the fact that the Hellenists all along recognized as orthodox Jews in Jerusalem, adopted that version under the conviction that it had the sanction of the High-Priest, it may surely be regarded as certain, that by divine appointment it belonged to him to draw the line between sacred and profane compositions, in other words to regulate the Canon of Scripture.

[1] Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, ii., p. 34, note 1.

CHAPTER VII.

At the coming of Christ the Jews had a fixed Canon. That Canon included, besides what is now contained in the Hebrew Bible, all that then belonged to the Alexandrine version.

From first to last, unbroken religious communion and fraternal relations were cherished between the Jews of Egypt and those of Palestine. But by both those who belonged to Samaria were treated as outside the pale of the Jewish church, as appears from the Old Testament,[1] the Gospel[2] and Josephus;[3] while their temple on Mount Garizim was execrated as a refuge of renegades, and a place unworthy of any consideration.[4] It was far otherwise with regard to the temple at Leontopolis; for it was not only frequented and venerated by the Egyptian Jews and other Hellenists, but at the very least tolerated, if not sanctioned, by the highest ecclesiastical authority at Jerusalem. To account for so marked a distinction made by the Palestinian Jews between the temple at Garizim and that at Leontopolis, may not be an easy matter, although all admit that it existed, and was at all times rigidly enforced. Yet, it seems that a ready explanation may be found in the difference of the causes which led to the creation of the two sanctuaries. The former was the work of an apostate, and was sought as an asylum by all who, being actuated by his spirit, would no longer be tolerated at Jerusalem. The latter

[1] Nehem. iv. 8.

[2] John iv. 9.

[3] *Antiq.*, B. xiii., c. iii., § 4; B. xx., c. vi., § 1.

[4] Ibid., B. xi., c. viii; B. xiii., c. iii., § 4.

claimed as its founder one whose right to the High Priesthood nobody disputed, and was intended by him, not as a refuge for outcasts, but as a shrine where all who found themselves by choice or necessity in Egypt could worship after the same form, as their fathers had done before them. As such it had been started, and as such it was continued, until the Emperor Vespasian, fearing that it might become a rallying point for the subjugated but still turbulent Jews, directed that it should be shut up. While it stood, was it not possible, some might have said, that Onias, being the only rightful heir to the chair of Aaron, might have carried with him to Egypt all the authority belonging to Aaron's office, and transmitted it to those who succeeded him at Leontopolis? Besides, it might have been argued, that the ordinance of Moses prohibiting sacrifice, unless in the place which God should choose, referred only to the land of Canaan. In that case, while the temple in Garizim was clearly unlawful, that at Leontopolis could not be considered schismatical nor even irregular. Add to this the flagrant disorders, which, as all know who have read the Books of Machabees, the works of Josephus, or even the four Gospels, disgraced the conduct of many of the High Priests at Jerusalem. Ambition and avarice, sacrilege and simony, murder and rapine, drunkenness and concubinage, apostasy and paganism, are among the crimes laid to the charge of several who, from the compulsory flight of Onias until the final destruction of the Jewish commonwealth, right or wrong, occupied the highest position in the Temple of Jerusalem. And to the black list of enormities entered up against them must be added the perpetration of atrocities, to the honor of humanity, rare among any class of men, but specially revolting in a minister of God—matricide,[1] fratricide[2] and the indiscriminate slaughter of hundreds of Jewish women and

[1] Jos., *Antiq.*, B. xiii., c. xi., § 1.

[2] Ibid., B. xi., c. vii., § 1.

children.[1] The office often carried with it supreme authority in civil affairs, and was not unfrequently disposed of to the highest bidder.[2] And for some time before the city was besieged by Titus, a band of assassins, who tyrannized over the inhabitants, without any regard to the right of succession or the qualifications which the office required in its occupant, appointed whomsoever they pleased. The last to fill the office was Phannias, a mere rustic, though of the line of Aaron, but selected for it by lot, as the assassins had directed.[3] Vacancies in the High Priesthood were often caused by expulsion as well as death. So that, though at first there could be but one High Priest, in the course of the time, and especially towards the end of the theocracy, the coexistence of several High Priests was a common affair. Appointments and removals were arbitrarily made, not only by the native princes, but even by foreign potentates, who from time to time extended their sway over Palestine;[4] and the selections on such occasions were not always in the line of regular succession, nor even from the tribe of Levi.[5]

No wonder that dire portents of impending calamities were seen at Jerusalem.[6] Surely, good men (and there were still many such) must have asked themselves, is God about to abandon his sanctuary, or has He already done so; and are we henceforth to look to the temple of Onias as the seat of His majesty, and the hallowed spot where He has placed His name? For so far as known, while the conduct of the High Priest at Jerusalem must have been too often a stumbling block and a reproach to God's people; that of Onias and his successors was not unworthy of the brightest period in the history of those dignitaries, who exercised the authority of the supreme pontificate

[1] Joseph. *Antiq.* B. xiii., c. xiv., § 1-2 *Wars*, B. i., c. iv., § 6.

[2] II. Mach. iv. 28, 24. [3] Jos., *Wars.*, B. iv., c. iii., § 6–8.

[4] II. Mach iv. 7, 8, 24. [5] Ibid., iii. 4; iv. 23–29. [6] Jos., *Wars.* B. vi., c. v., § 3.

in Solomon's gorgeous Temple, or in the less pretentious shrine of the wandering tabernacle. While such was the state of religion among the Jews in Palestine and Egypt, those of the latter country had gradually adopted the additions made to the Septuagint as left by the interpreters, and duly authorized by the High Priest at Jerusalem when crimes among those who ministered to the Lord were there comparatively unknown. Strange would it not be, if in the circumstances the Palestinian Jews failed to follow the example thus set by their Egyptian brethren, especially as no word of warning, protest, or prohibition was uttered by High Priest or Sanhedrim? That the Palestinian Jews did actually embrace in their canon all the books comprised in the Old Testament used by the Hellenists, cannot, of course, be absolutely demonstrated. But the facts all point that way. And if there ever was a case in which presumptive evidence leads to a morally certain conclusion, surely the case before us is such. For in it all the circumstances are of a nature to indicate, that if there was among the Jews at the time a *canon* of Scripture, as that word is now understood, that canon was necessarily *one*, and that *one* no other than the *one* which the apostles found among the Hellenists and delivered to the churches which they planted.

It has been seen in the course of the present work, that there is abundant evidence to prove that the Jews, ever since their final dispersion as a nation, have held: first, that from the time of Moses onward they possessed a canon of Scripture, or what is equivalent, a collection of books regarded by them as divine; and second, that that canon was completed and closed by Esdras the Scribe. The first of these points is and has been agreed on by all Christians who believe that the Bible was written by men inspired for that purpose. The second is admitted, even insisted on, by most

Protestants; who, however, to avoid chronological difficulties, say, that the canon was not closed until probably more than a century after the time of Esdras, when Simon the Just brought it to its present condition; after which, they assert, no further additions were or could be made to it. But as the second point stands, it has been absolutely rejected by all Catholics. For, while some, probably by far the greater number among them, have at all times believed that the canon now received by the Jews was principally the work of Esdras, but neither completed nor closed before the Christian era, when it was what it still is, being, however, then under apostolic sanction enlarged by the addition of the deutero books; and others insist, that besides the present or Palestinian canon there was an Alexandrine canon, which was received by the Hellenists, it being identical with the one approved by the Council of Trent; and others again are of opinion that the Esdrine canon received additions from time to time, until it assumed the dimensions of the Alexandrine canon, the only one in use at last among the Palestinians as well as Hellenists,—a few, with several Protestant critics, now contend, that until after the apostles had commenced their labors, the Jews had no well defined canon of Scripture. Then and not before (say these) did the Jews decide on adopting the one which they now follow.

Enough having been said already on the second point for which the Jews contend, it is now proposed to consider whether, consistently with all the facts in the case, it can be maintained, that until the apostolic age the Jews had no fixed canon, or whether these facts are such as to prove the very contrary. In entering on this inquiry we are necessarily confronted by the first point insisted on by the Jews and conceded by most Christians, that the former have had a canon of Scriptures from the time of Moses up to the present, incomplete

at first as is implied, and not closed until long afterwards. But a word or two on this part of the subject is all that is needed, since the point is one which no Christian with a due respect for the Bible will dispute. Moses, we learn, after writing the Law,[1] delivered it to the priests and all the elders of Israel, telling them to read it every seventh year, in the hearing of all Israel, and then commanded the Levites, who carried the ark, to place it beside the ark. Of course, they did so. He further directed,[2] that, when a king should be appointed, he, from a copy provided by the priests, should write out the Law, have it with him, and read it all the days of his life, so that he might thus keep God's words and ceremonies, which were commanded in it. That these directions were not altogether disregarded is proved by what is said of Josaphat,[3] Josias,[4] and others.[5] And that the people, even after the captivity, still remembered that their fathers had been accustomed to hear the Law read, is implied in the request made to Esdras.[6] To this volume containing the law must be added probably the Book of Josue, which, or at least part of which, the author wrote in the volume of the Law of the Lord.[7] Thus Josue and Moses[8] are both represented as writers, each in the work of which, according to the almost unanimous belief of Jews and Christians, he was the author. Now, at least portions of what had been written by them were carefully deposited for the use of future generations in the holiest place, within the precincts of the tabernacle or temple. The writings of which these

[1] Deut. xxxi. 9, 10, 11. 25, 26. According to Cornely (*Introd. spec. in* L. S. V. T., ii., 42.) by "Law" is here meant the entire Pentateuch.

[2] Deut. xvii. 18, 19.

[3] II. Paral. xvii.

[4] IV. Kings xxii. 16; xxiii. 2; II. Paral. xxxiv. 24, 30, 31.

[5] Nehem. viii. 3, 18; ix. 3; xiii. 1; II. Mach. viii. 23.

[6] Nehem. viii. 1.

[7] Josue xxiv. 26.

[8] Exodus xxiv. 4, 7; xxxiv. 27, 28; Num. xxxiii. 2; Deut. xxviii. 58; xxxi. 9, 22, 24.

portions were extracts—the Pentateuch and Josue—were regarded by the Jews with the greatest veneration; in fact, were considered by them divine. It could not be otherwise. For their authors were proved by their acts to have possessed divine authority. Those among the Jews who were contemporary with Moses and Josue had the same reason for believing their writings to be divine, as the first Christians had for concluding that the Gospels were dictated by the Holy Ghost. Here, then, we have the germ, as it were, of the sacred canon, and of this germ the High Priest, and he alone, was the official guardian. For Moses had directed, that no one but him should enter into the Holy of Holies, where the Ark with the Book of the Law beside it was kept, and him but once a year.[1] Thus the only man who could identify the venerable record, allow it to be transcribed, or verify a copy of it, was the High Priest—another and a by no means frivolous reason for believing, that not only the care of the Sacred Scriptures was entrusted to the High Priest, but that the final judgment as to their canonicity was pronounced by him. Of course, therefore, when the time seemed propitious for reproducing and enforcing the Law once more, Helcias had no difficulty in finding it, for as its official custodian he knew where it had been hidden away to save it from destruction or desecration. And of course, too, when at the suggestion of his Jewish counsellors, Ptolemy Philadelphus decided on securing a Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures, he, instructed by the Jews of his court, understood well that the High Priest was the only one from whom competent interpreters and a correct Hebrew copy of those Scriptures could be obtained. This, however, by the way, as something beside the scope of the present remarks.

It is evident from what has been said above, that,

[1] Lev. xvi. 2 34. Heb. ix. 7; Josephus, II. *Contra Ap.*, § 8.

when the Pentateuch was finished, and at least that part of it which to its author seemed the most important was deposited by the side of the Ark, the Jews had a canon, incomplete indeed, but soon enlarged by the addition of the book of Josue, and designed to comprise the contributions of other inspired writers, until God's holy purpose in communicating with mankind in this way should be fulfilled. It seems most likely, that before the revolt of the ten tribes no book had been, or at least was publicly known, to have been added to this nucleus of a canon; else the Samaritan bible would contain more than a moderately correct copy of the Pentateuch, and what may be called a grotesque book of Josue.[1] The schimatics would, of course, have excluded from their bible not only the writings of Solomon, against whose arbitrary rule they had protested, but such books of kings as might have been then written; since in them they would have found a history of the house of David, in which they no longer desired to have any part. But they could have no objection to include in their bible Judges and Ruth, as these books contained records in whose study and preservation they had an equal interest with the two tribes, which remained loyal to Roboam. There is, therefore, good reason for believing, that at the time of the schism, the only books generally received as canonical were the five of Moses and that of Josue. That before that time, however, as well as after, many books were written is certain. Solomon's books, of course, preceded the schism, and the same remark, no doubt, applies to Judges, Ruth, and the early portion of Kings; though the canonicity of all these was not then decided, or not publicly known. The other books belong to various subsequent

[1] If it be true, as Josephus says (I. *against Apion.*, § 6), and there seems to be no reason to doubt it, the writing of the national records was committed to the high priests and prophets, many records besides those of Moses and Josue must have been already written before the death of Solomon.

dates; and the time when, as well asthe authority by which, they were placed on the canon is still a matter of dispute.

It is well known that collections of writings were made among the Jews from time to time.[1] In fact, the very principles on which Jewish society was based rendered this necessary. For these writings very generally contained genealogical tables or statements, by which the position and rights of each family and its relations to other families had to be determined. And therefore, whenever the country was disturbed by military operations, the priests, as soon as peace was restored, by collating, examining, and rewriting these records; repaired whatever injury they had received during the preceding period of strife.[2] That this was probably often necessary appears from the fact, that the invaders of Judea seem to have well understood that the patriotism of the inhabitants was inspired and sustained in a great measure by their sacred literature, and they, therefore, "cut in pieces, and burnt with fire the Books of the Law of God," and even "put to death every one with whom the books of the Testament of the Lord were found."[3] That on such occasions some portions of the sacred literature possessed by the Jews must have perished, can hardly be doubted, especially since in what is left of it the names of books now no longer extant are frequently mentioned. That many of the Hebrew books, which escaped the blind malice of the Gentiles and the many dangers incidental to written records, belonged to that class of Scripture now rejected by all Christians as apocryphal, while a fair proportion of the whole was worthy of a place on the same catalogue with the earliest contributions to the canon, few will venture to deny. And therefore all the circumstances warrant the belief

[1] II. Mach. ii. 13, 14.

[2] Josephus, I. *Contra Apion.*, § 7.

[3] I. Mach. i. 59, 60.

that the collections, which pious and learned men from age to age made of the Hebrew writings, comprised books that were divine, books that at the time were doubtful, and books that were purely human. But that such an incongruous mixture should remain any length of time without sifting, and thus at last be popularly regarded as God's holy word, is not consistent with that constant care of divine Providence, which, in all the vicissitudes that befell the Jews, preserved among them the only true religion, and had already selected their records as the channels through which He was to communicate His will and a knowledge of Himself to all nations. There must have been at hand, all through from Moses to the Messiah, a means for separating the divine from the human in all such collections. And there was, that means being the supreme authority vested in the High Priest, and by which he was enabled to pass upon and decide definitively the constituent parts of the canon. True, it cannot be proved, that the books written before the captivity were already collected into a canon when that calamity occurred, any more than it can be shown, that the first collection of the kind was made in the time of Esdras. But all the circumstances point that way. The books were in existence. The court, whose duty it was to pronounce judgment on their merits, was still in session. And the impending crisis was of a nature to require, that before its consummation the people (if the matter had not been already attended to) should be provided with copies of the divine records, or at least told what books they were to receive as such during their captivity.

The theory, therefore, that the Jews had no fixed canon until long after they rejected Christ, may be dismissed as inconsistent with all the facts in the case. Besides, no one doubts that the Jews, from the time of Moses, have always believed that they possessed written

records, and that they considered these records divine. Their writers both sacred and profane have often so stated. The fact is abundantly attested, for instance, in the works of Josephus and Philo. And the Old Testament is full of references to the same fact.[1] Besides, it appears from the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, that already more than a century before the time of Christ those records consisted of books divided into three classes, "the law, the prophets, and the rest of the books," this last class comprising all such books as might be designated "psalms," as seems implied in the words of Our Lord where he refers to the things that "are written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms."[2] Josephus, also, who wrote near the end of the first century, recognizes the same classification, when he speaks of the five books by Moses, thirteen by the prophets, and four containing hymns and moral precepts.[3] It is therefore certain, that long before the theocracy became extinct, such authoritative action had been taken regarding the books, that it was well known, not only how many classes they were composed of, but how many belonged to each class; though it is not said what particular books were included in the last two classes. Any doubt, however, on this point is cleared up by the actual contents of that copy of the Old Testament, which the apostles left with the churches which they founded.

It cannot, therefore, be admitted consistently with these considerations, that the Jews had no certain well-defined canon until after the time of Christ; and the only reason for such a supposition, after all, is found in the doubts said to have been expressed by some Rabbins

[1] Ex. xxiv. 7; Deut. xxviii. 58; Jos. viii. 31; I. Kings x. 25; I. Paral. xxix. 29; Nehem viii. 1; I. Mach. i. 59; xii. 2; II. Mach. viii. 23, with many other texts.

[2] Luke xxiv. 44.

[3] I. *Contra Apion.*, § 8.

shortly before, and on the occasion of the convention at Jamnia,[1] about A. D. 90. It may, indeed, be granted that there was some, even considerable difference of opinion among the Jewish doctors at that time. For nothing else was to be expected, even if it be supposed that the Alexandrine canon had been approved by Eleazar, or some of his immediate successors in the High Priesthood at Jerusalem. Historians, both sacred and profane, have drawn an appalling picture of the gross abuses connected with the appointment of, and of the atrocious crimes committed by those men who filled, rather disgraced, the office of High Priest at Jerusalem for some years before the subversion of the Jewish commonwealth.[2] These historians were themselves Jews, and eye-witnesses of many of the scenes which they describe. For a long time after the institution of the High Priesthood, its occupant retained his office during life. But towards the last, the removals became so frequent that the co-existence of several who had performed the functions of High Priest followed as a matter of course. Josephus makes mention of one who in the time of Herod was "made High Priest for a single day."[3] In B. C. 36, Ananelus was the first High Priest appointed by Herod, who soon after substituted for him his own brother-in-law Aristobulus, a boy not seventeen years of age. But Herod, having put him to death, reappointed Ananelus.[4] All this happened in the inside of three years. After Herod's death, his arbitrary manner of filling the office of High Priest was continued by the Roman governors, but they had no recourse to his summary method of dispatching that official. Thus, A. D. 23, Annas was removed to make

[1] Supra, p, 68.

[2] Supra, pp. 107, 108.

[3] *Antiq.*, B. xvii., c. vi., § 4.

[4] Ibid., B. xv., c. ii., § 4; c. iii., § 1; c. ii., § 6; c. iii., § 3.

room for Ishmael. The next year Eleazar was directed to take the place of Ishmael. The following year Eleazar was deposed, and the office given to Simon. And the very next year Simon had to step down in favor of Joseph, called Caiphas.[1] That is four High Priests in so many years. From the commencement of the reign of Herod until the destruction of the Temple there had been an interval of 107 years. During that period the number of High Priests was twenty-eight.[2] Now, if it be supposed that every one of these was appointed, or succeeded to the office, immediately on the death or removal of his predecessor, the duration of each incumbency would average only a little more than three years and nine months. This fact, together with the influences under which, according to the Jewish historian, and the testimony recorded in the inspired books of Machabees, vacancies were made and filled in the office of the High Priesthood, shows very clearly that its occupants, besides being too often notoriously incompetent, had neither the liberty nor the leisure, and much less the security necessary for a full and faithful discharge of all the duties pertaining to their sacred trust. That trust, if attended to at all, must in its most important features have been discharged by others, whose acts in the case, as done in violation of the ordinance by Moses, would be null and void.

But by whom and how were such acts done? for that they were done there is no doubt. The whom and the how in the matter are clearly indicated in the New Testament,[3] and the writings of Josephus.[4] It thus appears, that for at least almost a century before the time of Christ, and until the destruction of Jerusalem, the supreme authority in religious matters, and at times

[1] Ibid., xviii., c. ii., § 2.

[2] Ibid., B. xx., c. x.

[3] Matt. xxvi. 59; Mark xvi. 1, seq.

[4] *Life*, § 12; *Antiq.*, B. xiv., c. ix., § 3; "Wars," B. ii., c. xx., § 5; B. iv., c. v., § 4.

in court affairs, was exercised by a tribunal known among the Jews as the Sanhedrim or Council. As it was modelled upon the institution founded by Moses,[1] the Sanhedrim,—which held its sessions in Jerusalem, decided in causes of the highest importance, and received appeals from the subordinate councils, consisting each of seven judges in the other cities,—was composed of seventy members. These included chief priests, ancients, and scribes.[2] The chief priests were the heads of the sacerdotal families or courses.[3] The ancients, or elders, were at first probably heads of tribes, but towards the end of the theocracy they seem to have been those members of the Sanhedrim who, being neither chief Priests nor scribes, were considered qualified to occupy seats in the same court with them, on account of their knowledge, experience, and respectability. The scribes acted as secretaries, notaries, copyists, expounders of the Scripture, lawyers, and teachers, and are first mentioned in the time of David, although long before that there must have been men who discharged some of the functions which they exercised. But as readers and expounders of the Scriptures they claimed Esdras as the founder of their profession. The other two classes of which the Sanhedrim was composed, traced their origin as far back as the age of Moses. Besides the Essenes, a Jewish sect remarkable for the ascetic life of its members, there were two other sects among the Jews—the Pharisees and Sadducees. Their origin is uncertain, but they are known to have been disturbing elements in Jewish society about B. C. 108, in the reign of John Hyrcanus.[4] The Pharisees overlaid Gods written word with puerile and false traditions; while the Sadducees, if they did not reject all of that word ex-

[1] Num. xi. 16.

[2] Mark xv. 1; Luke xxii. 66 seq.

[3] *Dixon, Introd. to S. Script.*, 11, 121.

[4] Jos., *Antiq.*, B. xiii., c. x., § 5; IV. Mach. vii.

cept what was written by Moses, perverted its meaning like the Pharisees, saying "there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit."[1] One part of the Sanhedrim seems to have been made up of Pharisees, the other of Sadducees; at least, that appears to have been the case on the occasion of one session.[2] And though religiously and politically opposed to each other, they made common cause against Christ[3] and his religion in its infancy.[4] As among the Pharisees in general respect for the tradition of the ancients was insisted on as an indispensable part of religion, the same tenet had its advocates among the scribes.[5] And while the sympathies of some among the latter were probably enlisted on the side of the Pharisees, others among them, there is little doubt, looked with favor on the principles professed by the Sadducees. For, the errors and abuses advocated and practised by either sect seem to have been tolerated, if not approved, by all whose learning and social position raised them above the level occupied by the common people. Of these errors and abuses the scribes, however, are represented in the Gospel as not only apologists, but strenuous defenders; and therefore they are very justly included in the woes and bewares launched by our Lord against both sects.[6] Yet, though the Pharisees were notorious for their hypocrisy and pride, and the Sanhedrim, in which they possessed great, if not a controlling influence, is known to have utterly disregarded the ordinary restraints of moderation and justice in many of its proceedings, what is said of Nicodemus,[7] Joseph of Arimathea,[8] and Gamaliel[9] shows that there were men in each body free from the sins which prevailed among a majority of their associates. Some of

[1] Acts xxiii. 8. [2] Acts xxiii. 6. [3] Matt. xvi. 1 seq.
[4] Acts xxiii. 6. [5] Matt. xv. 1, 2..
[6] Ibid. xvi. 6; xxiii.; Luke xx. 46. [7] John iii. 1—9; vii. 50, 54; xix. 39.
[8] Matt. xxvii. 57, 60; Mark xv. 43, 46. [9] Acts v. 34, 39.

the priests were Pharisees; Josephus, himself a priest, was a member of the sect;[1] so was Jozar, another priest.[2] Very probably others of the priestly stock were Sadducees; Caiphas the High Priest, who condemned Our Lord, likely belonged to that sect.[3] But it is certain that Ananias, another High Priest, who in the year 62 had St. James the Less stoned to death, was a Sadducee.[4]

But enough. Long before the date just mentioned High Priest and Sanhedrim, to the crimes of which they were but too often guilty, had added those of heresy and blasphemy, thus showing, that the light of heaven had been already withdrawn from them. And the appalling cry of "Let us go hence," which is said to have greeted the ears of the priests, as they entered by night the inner court of the temple,[5] simply announced that all was finished, and that the last act in a tragedy which had commenced in a gradual corruption of revealed religion, and culminated in the rejection of the Messiah by God's own people, was about to close with their extinction as a nation, and their seeming reprobation as a race.

Here might be the proper place for discussing the relations of the High Priest to the Sanhedrim, in order to ascertain whether, as Milman[6] and others say, "the Sanhedrim . . . . usurped in some degree upon the authority of the High Priest" or, as Calmet[7] with some critics believes, the judicial authority attached originally to the office of the latter remained intact to the last. Such discussion here, however, is uncalled for, as the object of the present argument can be reached without wasting time in considering a point, about which eminent writers are not agreed. For, whether or not the Sanhedrim had encroached on the authority inherent in

[1] *Life*, § i., 2. [2] Ibid. § 39. [3] Acts iv. 1; v. 17.
[4] Jos., *Antiq.*, B. xx. c. ix., § 1. [5] Ibid., *Wars*, B. vi., c. v., § 3.
[6] *Hist. of the Jews*, ii., 115. [7] *Dissert. de Pol. et Sanhed. Hebr.*

the High Priest's office—when it is remembered, that for some time before the destruction of the Temple, and even before the coming of Christ, that office was in some instances a matter of bargain and sale, at times conferred on a favorite by the predominant political faction or the secular prince, even though a pagan; that the successful competitor was not always entitled to it by right of succession or even descent from Aaron; and that his tenure of the dignity depended not so much on his own good conduct, as on the caprice of the civil ruler, or the intrigues of violent parties struggling for supremacy—the conclusion must be, that the judicial acts of the High Priest were so tainted as to be generally doubtful,—it might be said, unquestionably invalid.

It does not appear that from the time of Eleazar the High Priest, who provided Ptolemy Philadelphus with a copy of the Hebrew Scriptures and interpreters to translate it into Greek, until the advent of the Redeemer, the compass of the Sacred Scriptures occasioned any discussion among Palestinians and Hellenists; though it is well known that the books constituting the divine collection were all held in great veneration, and carefully studied by both classes of Jews. Nor is there anything to show that between the two classes, or the members of either, this point was at any time within the period mentioned a subject of controversy; on the contrary, there is good reason to believe that it was one on which, as yet, no diversity of sentiment had been conceived, much less expressed. For the Jewish writers, whether sacred or profane, who flourished during the interval in question, make no reference whatever to any disagreement of the kind. Now, while this was the case, the Alexandrine version, with all the deutero books, was in constant use among the Jews throughout the Roman Empire, and even in the hands of all who, understanding Greek, continued to reside in Palestine. But no one

can say, what books in the meantime were contained in the Hebrew Bible, with the exception of the five Books of Moses, which constituted the first class. For the terms applied to the other two classes—the prophets, and the rest of the psalms or hymns—are too vague for any one to draw up an exact list of them. The attempt has been made, but hardly any two of those who did so have reached the same result. Nevertheless, the very general use made of the Greek version, with its deutero books, by all Greek-speaking Jews, together with the acquiescence in, not to say the sanction of, this practice by those Jews who, either from choice or necessity, read the Scriptures in the Hebrew,—elders and scribes, Pharisees and Sadducees, Levites and priests, chief priests, Sanhedrim, and High Priests,—render it morally certain, that that version with all belongnig to it was universally approved by the Jewish Church. In fact, it was not until far in the second century, that any objection was made by any section of Jews to the use of the Greek version; nor was it until some time in the sixth century that it was finally rejected by the Hellenists. Indeed, the rabbinical Doctors had disputed about the canonicity of some books now in the Hebrew Bible, long before they condemned as unlawful the use of the Septuagint. These disputes originated in a diversity of sentiment between two schools, founded or headed, one by Rabbi Hillel, the other by Rabbi Shammai, members of the Sanhedrim, and the only ones spared by Herod, when he put to death all belonging to that body. As stated in a preceding page,[1] in order to preserve due reverence for, and prevent the unnecessary use of the sacred books, it had been decided that to touch them defiled the hands. This rendered it necessary to declare what books were sacred, so that all might know when, after handling books, the ceremony of purifying the

[1] Note 2, p. 68.

hands had or had not to be performed. But the attempt to clear up such an abstruse point in rabbinical casuistry developed discordant views among the Doctors. The strife was occasioned by Canticles and Ecclesiastes, whose power to defile the hands some advocated while others denied. At last, however, in an assembly held at Jamnia, about A. D. 90, the controversy was brought to a close by a decision declaring, that defilement was the fate in store for all hands that touched either book. And thus, at last, if the Jewish writers are to be believed, their canon was brought to its present condition. At least, this conclusion follows from their own statements.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE CANON APPROVED BY THE HIGH PRIEST AND CURRENT AMONG THE JEWS UNTIL THE COMING OF CHRIST, MUTILATED BY THE RABBINS WITHIN THE CHRISTIAN PERIOD, IN THAT CONDITION FOLLOWED EVER SINCE BY THE JEWS, AND FINALLY IMPOSED ON THE REFORMERS BY THEIR RABBINICAL TEACHERS.

The conclusion just stated is not correct, because it seems taken for granted, that by the action had at Jamnia every book now belonging to the Jewish canon, and about which there had been any doubt, was then officially placed thereon. But this was not the case. For, had it been so, Melito [1] Bishop of Sardis, when giving, about the middle of the second century, a list of books on the Jewish, rather rabbinical canon, [2] would not have omitted, as he has done, all mention of the book of Esther. And no doubt Esther, with the other deutero books, were the very "many scriptures," which, according to St. Justin Martyr, a contemporary of Melito, the Jews "completely wiped out of the translation which was made by the Elders who were with Ptolemy." [3] St. Justin adds, that "it is only a short time since they were wiped out," [4] as if the spread of the Christian religion had driven the Jews to this sacri-

[1] Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, B. iv., c. 26.

[2] From the time that the divinely appointed superintendence of the High Priest over the canon was usurped, the canon became unsettled, and was supplanted by what is properly called the rabbinical canon, which was by no means the genuine Jewish canon.

[3] *Dialog. with Trypho*, § 71. [4] Ibid., §. 72.

legious act, in order to maintain their ground. But, he continues, such as have been quoted out of the Scriptures spared by the Jews "are more than enough to prove the points in dispute, besides *those which we have retained.*" [1] As much as to say, that until recently there had been one, and but one, common collection of sacred Scriptures, out of which, however, the Jews had dropped some, while the Christians retained them all. Origen, who lived about a century later, while enumerating the books on the Jewish canon in his time, includes among them not only "Jeremias with Lamentations," but "his Epistle"—the last chapter at least, if not the entire book, of Baruch, the whole of which has since disappeared from the Jewish canon. Origen further remarks, that he found among the Jews, though outside the other books, Machabees, "which are inscribed *Sarbeth Sarbane El*" [2]—probably the sceptre of the prince of the sons of God." In a part [3] of the Apostolical Constitutions, which is supposed to have been written about the middle of the third century, it is stated that the Jews on the tenth of the month Gorpiæus assemble together and read the Lamentations of Jeremias and Baruch. This testimony, as well as that of Origen just cited, convinced William Whiston, a learned Anglican theologian, that the book of Baruch was canonical. [4] Hilary of Poitiers, who flourished in the fourth century, corroborates the statements of Origen and the Apostolical Constitutions. For, while enumerating the books on the Jewish canon in the Prologue to his Explanation of the Psalms, when he comes to Jeremias, he says, "Jeremias with Lamentations, and Epistle," and he further remarks that to some (Jews, for it is of them he speaks) it seemed proper, by adding Tobias and Judith, to increase the 22 books to 24, that being the number of letters in the Greek alpha-

[1] Ibid., § 73.
[2] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, B. vi., c. 25.
[3] B. v, c. 20.
[4] Kitto's *Cycl.* on *Baruch.*

bet. Referring to these two books, St. Jerome, who wrote in the fifth century, affirms in his Prologues, that Tobias, though separated from the catalogue of divine Scripture by the Jews, was placed by them among the Hagiographa, and Judith was read by them also among the Hagiographa. Epiphanius, whose life was also prolonged to the fifth century, remarks [1] even more distinctly than is done by Origen, that the Jews considered Baruch part of Jeremias; "up to that time when they (the Jews) returned from the Babylonian captivity, they (says he) had these prophets and books of prophets. The first is the Book of Genesis.... Jeremias the Prophet with Lamentations, and epistles as well of him as of Baruch." Epiphanius further observes, that, although Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus were not numbered among the Scriptures, and were not therefore placed in the Ark of the Covenant, they were regarded as "useful and profitable," [2] of course, by the Hebrews, for it is of them he is speaking. St. Isidore of Seville, who wrote about the beginning of the seventh century, has a remarkable statement about the rejection of Wisdom by the Jews. He says that the Hebrews, as one of the wise men remembers, received the book among the canonical Scriptures, but that after crucifying Christ they remembered, that the book contained proofs of His divine mission, and therefore, after consulting together, they excluded it from the prophetic volume, lest the Christians might make use of it to reproach them with having sacrilegiously put the Messiah to death. [3]

This mass of testimony renders it certain, that from the first to about the beginning of the fifth century the Jews had no fixed canon. Temple, altar, and High Priesthood had disappeared, and so had the canon. The class of teachers who from Moses downwards had ex-

[1] L. I., tom. I., *Hær.*, viii., no. vi. (Migne).

[2] *Tract. De Mens. et Pond.*, c. iv.

[3] *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis* L. I. c. xii.

pounded the law, and decided what books were to be added to the collection which he left, had ceased to exist, and their place was taken by the men who laid the foundations of the Talmud. The result of their labors in attempting to agree on a canon is before us. The first century had almost closed, before all discussion regarding the canonicity of Ecclesiastes and Canticles had ceased among them. It was only towards the dawn of the third century, that they allowed Esther to be placed among the inspired books. Before that a stranger might visit their schools in Palestine, and obtain a catalogue of all contained in their Old Testament. But he would have failed to find therein any mention of Esther, while, were he living a century later, such a visit would have convinced him, that that book, and even Baruch, were considered strictly canonical among the rabbinical doctors. The other deutero books, too, Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Machabees, it appears from the evidence, were treated by the Jews with a certain degree of consideration, if not veneration; they had them, and they read them with some hope of profit or advantage from doing so. Whether they believed these books to be divine or not cannot be known, but as they were allowed to have and to read them, it may reasonably be inferred that they recognized no difference between them and the other sacred books, especially as the opinions of their self-constituted teachers were uncertain, fluctuating, and even discordant on the subject. But what a change in a matter of so great importance. During New Testament times, or at any period before that, an inquirer will search in vain for any sign of doubt, hesitation, discussion, or controversy regarding the compass of written revelation. Up to near the close of the first century, the canon among all classes of Jews appears a fixed fact; but from that date until some period in the fifth century, it seems to have

been treated in rabbinical circles as a sort of sliding scale, or an unknown quantity. Two causes appear to have brought about this result. First, as the sacerdotal class no longer existed, or at least found it no longer possible to perform its functions, it became necessary that other arrangements, besides those hitherto employed for the purpose, should be made for the preservation of the Sacred Scriptures, as well as for the solution of all questions referring thereto. Of course, their studies and pursuits pointed to the scribes, as the only profession qualified to take charge of the inspired collection, still intact and the most precious relic of the fallen theocracy. Indeed, the Gospels show very clearly, that the scribes had already in the time of our Lord assumed or, usurped the care of the Scriptures; while the Rabbins, the learned masters belonging to that class of Jews, are known by their own statements to have subsequently carried on with each other the prolonged contest, which left the Jewish canon as we have it to-day. But the Gospels make it equally clear, that, however qualified the scribes may have been by their learning to guard the precious deposit which the course of events had placed in their keeping, their senseless veneration for the oral law, erroneously supposed to have been received from Moses, rendered them incapable of succeeding in the task they had undertaken. It is that oral law, or the comments thereon, or what passed as such at the time, that our Lord denounces as "the tradition of men."[1] And it is the advocates of that system whom he stigmatizes as "blind and leaders of the blind."[2] For with them, in matters of practice, that oral law was at least equal in authority to the written. Indeed, one needs no better proof than what is furnished in the Gospel, to be convinced; that the traditions, of which the former consisted, too often served as

[1] Mark vii. 8. [2] Matt. xv. 14.

a valid excuse for violating the spirit and even the letter of the written revelation.[1] Of that revelation these men could not be faithful guardians or interpreters, to whom its Author tauntingly said: "Well do you make void the commandments of God, that you may keep your own tradition."[2] Is it any wonder that the canon, whether practically or formally determined by the Jewish Church while its members still constituted an organized community in Palestine, should have been regarded as an open question by such teachers for centuries after the synagogue had taken the place of the Temple, and the authority of the High Priest, though really abolished, had been assumed by the Rabbins; and that, when at last these agreed on a canon, that canon should be found to differ materially from the one which the apostles, as Jews, had received from the Jewish Church for their own use, and which they, of course, afterwards placed in the hands of their Christian converts?

But there was another reason which, more than anything else, contributed to the uncertainty and fluctuation of the rabbinical canon for some centuries after the commencement of our era, and resulted at last in its permanent mutilation. Justin Martyr, so far as known, is the first, but by no means the only Christian writer, who charges the Jews with curtailing the Scriptures. His words given above are such as to show, that already in his time they had made considerable progress in the unholy work, though Melito's testimony renders it certain that, when he wrote (it could not have been very long after Justin), that work was still being prosecuted, but far from complete. We know, besides, from the statements of Justin and later Fathers, that the canon as it stood at the time, at least among Christians, was a cause of great embarrassment to the Jews, who found

[1] Matt. xii. 1–8; xv. 1–20; xxiii.; Mark vii. 1–23.

[2] Mark vii. 9.

it impossible to answer the arguments advanced against their tenets, unless by denying the canonicity of many of the texts on which those arguments were based. And this was the course adopted by Trypho in his dialogue with Justin. Trypho's experience was not exceptional. He probably was not the first, as he was not the last, Jewish controversialist who felt the necessity of maintaining his own ground in this way against his Christian antagonist. For, during long centuries the champions of the two religions seldom met, without engaging in tilts of the kind. On such occasions Trypho's tactics were so often employed, that it became the Christian to ascertain first, which of his books would be rejected by his opponent. In fact, he was accustomed to do so. There appears, therefore, no reason for doubting that the controversies between the Christians and Jews early convinced the latter, or rather their leaders, that it was necessary to shape anew their canon, in order to deprive the former of many of the Scriptural proofs, to which they appealed with stunning effect, when the relative merits of the two religions were the points discussed. But inasmuch as the Septuagint alone was current wherever Greek was understood (and that was generally wherever Jews were found outside of Palestine, and even there it was current side by side with the Hebrew Bible, whatever the latter contained at the time), the rabbinical doctors must have found it extremely difficult to agree on a definite collection of Scriptures, and to convince their followers that there was nothing wrong in excluding certain books from that collection.

There certainly can be no doubt, that at the time when the religious authorities at Jerusalem were brought face to face with Christianity as distinct from Judaism, and as not only multiplying "the number of its disciples in Jerusalem," but even adding to its ranks "a

multitude also of priests,"[1] and therefore a "heresy"[2] to be stamped out by all means, fair or foul, the Septuagint was, it may be said, universally used outside Palestine, and very generally even in that country, while the range of the Hebrew was necessarily very limited, being restricted mostly to Palestine. Without resorting to what has been already said on the subject, the reader will find in the Acts of the Apostles,[3] written at the time, enough to convince him that the circulation here claimed for the Septuagint among the Jews in the Apostolic age is not at all exaggerated. The point is admitted by Protestant writers, though their principles compel them to depreciate that version as compared with the original. Hence, Professor Smith asserts that "in the times of the New Testament the Greek and Hebrew Bibles were current side by side; and men like the Apostles, who knew both languages, used either text indifferently."[4] And Humphrey Hody[5] argues on the authority of Tertullian,[6] Justin Martyr,[7] and the Jerusalem Gemara,[8] that the Sacred Scriptures were read out of the Septuagint in the synagogues by the Hellenists. To supplant that copy with another of less compass, even though written in Greek, and thus withdraw from the people "many Scriptures,"[9] to which they were so long accustomed, was therefore a task which, in their actual circumstances, might well have seemed hopeless to those who endeavored in this way to prevent the dispersed Jewish communities from being engulphed in the rising tide of aggressive Christianity. None can better appreciate the difficulty of such a task than a modern Prot-

[1] Acts vi. 7. [2] Ibid. xxiv. 14.

[3] Kenrick, on Acts ii. 18; vii. 14; viii. 33; xiii. 34–41.

[4] *The O. Test, in the Jewish Church*, p. 102.

[5] *De Bibl. Text.*, pp. 224-227.

[6] *Apol.* c. 18. [7] *Ad Græcos Cohort.* p. 14. *Apol.* 2. pag. 72. *Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 297. 298. [8] *Sotah.* c. 7. [9] Justin M. *Dial. cum Tryph.* § 71.

estant. For he knows that the founders of his religion, more than three hundred years ago, attempted, as instructed by their rabbinical teachers, to mutilate the contents of the inspired volume, which, up to their own time, had circulated throughout Christendom; and that constant efforts in the same direction have been made ever since by the leaders of Protestant thought. But he also well knows, that only among the Protestants in Great Britain and America has the attempt been even partially successful, and that not until the present century. For on the continent of Europe Protestant Bibles still generally include the books, which the reformers rejected.[1] Yet, for mutilating the word of God the Protestants were much better equipped than the Jews, The former had the use of the printing press, the modern postal service, the willing co-operation of secular rulers, and above all the advantage resulting from a very common belief,—which all who embraced it soon, but too late to retrace their steps, found to be mistaken, —that the movement was destined to secure for the conscience liberty of belief, and for the individual freedom from all restraint. On the other hand, the Jews, dispersed, persecuted, and destitute of all such resources, had nothing to depend upon for success, beyond the wonderful activity and personal influence of their Rabbins, their own fanatical devotion to these fanatical leaders, and the growing conviction among them, that the only way to answer the arguments of the Christians was to contract the canon, by excluding therefrom as many as possible of those books from which the Christians drew their proofs. Yet, that they accomplished, not very long after they had decided on its necessity;

[1] Am. Encycl. iii. 235.—Baron Karl Hildebrand Canstein's Bible has the deutero intermingled with the proto books. Thirty years ago over 5,000,000 copies in the German language had been sold, besides those in the Bohemian language. —Ibid iv. 379. The sale, no doubt, still continues.

whereas the Protestants, after devoting centuries to the same task, are not now even convinced, that it was either wise or expedient to undertake it in the first place. Remarkable, however, is the coincidence of purpose and plan proposed by Jews and Protestants in this matter. The former endeavored to justify their rejection of the Messiah by excluding certain books from the canon; the latter sought to excuse their denial of doctrines taught by the Church of the Messiah, by placing these same books also outside the canon. And to complete the parallel, as the Jews, in order to withdraw from the use of the Old Septuagint all who among them read the Scriptures in Greek, and to have a Greek text of their own, with which they might meet the arguments of the Christians, had a new Greek version made of the Hebrew Bible as it stood in the second century, not as it existed about five hundred years before, when the seventy interpreters translated it for their Alexandrian brethren, so the Protestants, to wean their followers from the venerable Vulgate, and provide them with texts offensive as well as defensive in their controversies with Catholics, prepared for them translations of the Hebrew Bible, not of the second century,—for there was not then nor is there now any such older than the tenth century,—but of that Bible as they found it in the sixteenth century. Age is said to improve the quality of wine, but is admitted for many reasons to be deleterious to all documents, printed or written, especially when they have been often copied, as was the case with the Scriptures. The text, therefore, from which the Protestants translated, must have been far inferior to that from which the Vulgate, twelve hundred, and the Septuagint, nearly two thousand years before, had been executed.

Aquila, who prepared the Greek version for the Jews in the second century, had, therefore, before him a He-

brew text much purer than the one which Luther followed in the sixteenth. And as he understood Greek well, it being probably his vernacular, and was, besides, a much better Hebrew scholar than Luther, whose efforts as a translator were ridiculed by contemporary critics, he may with good reason be supposed to have creditably executed his task. According to the testimony of the Fathers and some fragments, which alone remain of his translation, he seems to have adhered closely, even slavishly, to the literal sense of the words, so that it has been remarked his work somewhat resembled a dictionary. Yet, as Luther's German in many passages represented his own errors, not the true sense of the Hebrew which he undertook to interpret, Aquila's Greek, being intended solely to provide the Jews with such a text as would enable them to maintain their position better on the principal point at issue between them and their Christian opponents, some of the Fathers, who had seen his translation, probably not without good reason, charged him with misinterpreting the sense of the Messianic passages in the original.

A native of Sinope, in Pontus, Aquila, while still a pagan, was appointed by his kinsman, the Emperor Hadrian, to rebuild Jerusalem. Admiring the virtues practised by the Christians whom he met there, he asked and obtained baptism; but persisting in the practice of astrology, to which he had been addicted before his conversion, he was excommunicated. Smarting under this disgrace, he resolved to embrace Judaism, became a proselyte, and was circumcised. At that time the most celebrated Rabbi among the Jews was the fiery but unfortunate Akiba, who, for the part he took in the last disastrous rebellion of his people against the Romans, was flayed alive in the reign of Hadrian. A disciple of Akiba, Aquila acquired a thorough knowledge of Hebrew; and being already familiar with Greek, he under-

took to supply the Jews with such a Greek translation as they could substitute for the Septuagint and appeal to with confidence, when discussing with Christians the question of the Messiahship. "From no honest motive did he," says Epiphanius,[1] "engage in this enterprise; his object was to falsify certain texts of the Scriptures, by impugning the seventy interpreters, in order to misrepresent the passages contained in the Old Testament regarding Christ." Two other Greek translations, written from other motives, appeared soon afterwards: one less literal, but more akin than Aquila's to the Septuagint; its author was Theodotion; the other rather a paraphrase than a version by Symmachus. The religious record of both these interpreters resembled somewhat that of Aquila. Besides these three, there were in early Christian times three other Greek versions from the Hebrew, but their authors are unknown, and there may have been others, of which no record remains. The memory of these six, however, has been preserved by the use which Origen made of them, when preparing his Hexaplar edition of the Septuagint.

Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus most probably omitted several, but certainly not all of the deutero Scriptures, as Franzelin[2] has shown. Of the versions prepared by these three interpreters, that of Aquila, as it was intended to fill a want felt by the Jews from the beginning of the second century, generally superseded the use of the Septuagint among them. So that, though the appearance of the latter had been hailed with joy in the beginning, and even annually celebrated, according to Philo,[3] by a festival at Alexandria, whose Jewish residents, with many others, as if to venerate the spot where it had been written, as well as to thank God for so great a gift, flocked to the place where the inter-

[1] *De Pond. et Mens.* c. xv.

[2] *De Div. Trad. et Scrip.* p. 457.

[3] *De vita Moysis*, L. 2.

preters dwelt while engaged upon it ; that version was at last so detested, especially by those who were as zealous for the tradition of the elders as for the written law, that it is said for the festival, by which its publication had been honored, a fast was substituted to deplore so inauspicious an event ; and the very day on which it first saw the light was considered equally fatal with that on which, by the criminal command of Jeroboam, the golden calves were consecrated, and the heavens, on account of that sacrilege, shrouded in darkness for three days.[1]

In fact, when the Jewish teachers perceived, as they really did about the beginning of the second century, or perhaps even sooner, that the Christians were able to prove from the Septuagint that the prophecies referring to the Messiah had been all literally fulfilled in the Christ whom the chief priests, scribes, and ancients a generation or two before had crucified, they had good reason to be convinced, that the possession of the Scriptures by these fearless adversaries had placed themselves at a great disadvantage. And if so, why should they not have profoundly regretted that their sacred books, instead of being kept, as at first, closely locked up in impenetrable Hebrew, and thus placed beyond the possible reach of all outside their own narrow circle, had been at last exposed to the whole world in vulgar Greek or any other living language whatever? Thus the decided preference given by the Rabbins to Acquila's Greek version over the Septuagint seems, after all, to have been merely the selection of what appeared to them the less of two evils ; and one, therefore, to be tolerated only so long as it was impossible to remove it.

A determined effort was, therefore, at last made by the Jewish teachers to restrict all their followers to the reading of the Scriptures in Hebrew. The use of all

[1] Calmet, *Dissert de Vers. Sept. Interp.*

Greek versions, even that of Aquila, was forbidden under pain of grave censures and dire anathemas; and every one was required in the synagogue to listen, not only as usual to the reading of the Law and the Prophecies, but of Mishnical expositions and traditions, and all in Hebrew. After the return from Babylon, when it was found that the people no longer understood Hebrew, in their religious meetings the lessons, after being read in Hebrew, were explained in Chaldee, or such other language as they understood. The attempt, therefore, of the rabbinical doctors to withdraw from their disciples a privilege regarded by the latter as not alone important, but in fact indispensable to a knowledge of the law, caused such serious disturbances, that the supreme authority of the state was compelled to interfere in the interest of public order. Therefore in the year 551, during the reign of Justinian, an imperial decree directed[1] that the Jews should be allowed to use any vernacular version. To such of them as understood Greek, the Septuagint in that decree is highly recommended, as being superior to all others handed down; not only on account of the evidently divine assistance by which the interpreters, though separated from each other, were enabled to write the same translation, but because, though appointed by God so long before, they, being enlightened by the spirit of prophecy, foresaw that, and made arrangements by which, the sacred books should be handed down to future generations. It is also asserted that "all use it." The use of Aquila's version, although defective in so far as it differs from the Septuagint, is permitted. But the reading of Mishnical or rabbinical traditions, which are merely human compositions destitute of any divine element, is strictly interdicted. Whoever should attempt to nullify the provisions contained in this law, were to be subjected to

[1] *Novella* 146.

corporal punishment and confiscation of goods. Hody[1] has cited on the same subject two other authorities, from one of which it appears simply that the Jews were permitted to read in the synagogue the Septuagint, Aquila's version, or versions in other languages, as might be found necessary, and that all who should interfere with the exercise of this privilege were to be punished by confiscation of property.[2] This statement is substantially confirmed by the other authority ; but it makes no mention of any penalty, and interdicts the reading of the "secondary law" as "not being contained in the sacred books."[3] The secondary law is, no doubt, the rabbinical traditions proscribed in the Novella.

If the statement of the Novella declaring that "all use it" be rightly and rigidly interpreted, it would seem that the reading of the Septuagint was universally practised by the Jews. But this can hardly have been the case in the middle of the sixth century. Otherwise the persistent efforts made by the Rabbins, during the four preceding centuries, to substitute Aquila's version for the Septuagint among their people must have failed utterly. This, however, is hardly conceivable. The more reasonable supposition is, that, the Rabbins having succeeded in greatly curtailing the circulation of the Septuagint among the rank and file of the Jews, next proposed to withdraw from them even Aquila's version, or any other copy of the Scripture, except such as was contained in the Hebrew language, a scheme against which tumultuous opposition was made by all not belonging to the rabbinical party. While endeavoring to restore order, the imperial authority availed itself of the opportunity thus presented to reduce the influence of the Rabbins by legalizing the resistance of their followers, and thus entice the latter to adopt as a standard copy

[1] *De Bibl. Text.*, 236.

[2] Photius, *Nomocanon.*, xii. 3.

[3] *Const. Eccles. Collectio*, lib. iii., tit. 3. *Edicto* 5.

of the Scripture the Septuagint, which, or versions of which, generally all Christians were then and had been all along using. With this purpose in view, the Novella insists on the great superiority of the Septuagint; and the stress laid on this point clearly indicates that the version was not generally circulating among the Jews; else, why should reasons be adduced to convince them of its excellence? Nevertheless, it is evident from the way in which it is referred to, that, though long before condemned by the Rabbins, it was still read by some of their followers. The future, however, demonstrated that no imperial decree could be framed that would perpetuate the lingering respect of even the latter for the Septuagint, or induce them to renounce all obedience to the behests of their rabbinical masters. For the Rabbins triumphed in the end; and ever since, the solemn reading of the Scriptures in the Jewish assemblies has been conducted in the Hebrew and Chaldee languages,[1] according to the example set by Esdras the Scribe. But the exposition, as had been always the case, was made in the language understood by those in attendance.[2] At present, however, the general practice is to read the lessons from the Pentateuch and Prophets only in the Hebrew and vernacular, whatever that vernacular may happen to be.

[1] Prideaux, *Connex.*, Part ii., 42. [2] Kitto's *Cycl.*, *Synagogue.*

CHAPTER IX.

THE EXISTING JEWISH CANON, MODERN AND INCOMPLETE, POSSESSED NO DOUBT OF RABBINICAL SANCTION, BUT NEVER APPROVED BY, OR SUBMITTED TO THE TRIBUNAL INSTITUTED BY GOD IN THE OLD LAW, FOR THE PURPOSE OF GUARDING THE INTEGRITY OF HIS WRITTEN WORD, AND DISCRIMINATING BETWEEN HUMAN AND DIVINE COMPOSITIONS. ONE OF THREE THEORIES DISCUSSED.

With the final rejection of the Septuagint by the Jews, the history of that version among them was brought to a close. But that history had been such, that it must have influenced in a very considerable degree the action of the Rabbins, when they undertook in their own way to solve the then complicated problem of the canon. For, hardly had the conflict between them and the Christians commenced, when they discovered to their surprise, that the Septuagint, really the Vulgate of the time, in its allusions to the characteristics of the Messiah, would prove a formidable weapon in the hands of their intrepid antagonists. And as that conflict extended into fresh fields of controversy, they became convinced at last, that defeat was inevitable, unless they could show that the Greek text, to which their adversaries appealed, did not express the true sense of the original; or unless they could contrive to substitute for that text another in Greek, specially made in their interest, and so literally literal, that while by reason of its rigid adherence to the abstract meaning of

each Hebrew word, regardless of the shading reflected from the context, its absolute accuracy could not be denied, it might thus at last win its way to the favor of the Christians, but few of whom, by critical inquiry, would discover that in it the spirit and scope of the original had been obscured or lost. With this purpose, the proselyte Aquila, whose thirst for revenge on those by whom he had been excommunicated needed no stimulant, was encouraged to undertake a new Greek version. But if its author and his patrons hoped that it would supplant the Septuagint, they were doomed to bitter disappointment. For the work of the seventy interpreters long held its ground, even among the Hellenistic Jews, as well as the Christians, as it still does among the latter in the East; while copies of it, as they are now, were found in the hands of the educated classes throughout the West. But from the first, the version of Aquila secured few readers outside Graeco-Judaic circles, and seems to have utterly disappeared as a whole about the time of St. Jerome.

Some of the Fathers, in consequence of the hostile attitude assumed by the Jews, not only towards the Christian religion, but towards the Christian Bible, probably not without good reason charged the Rabbins with attempting to corrupt the Scriptures. For, though it cannot be proved that the purity of the Hebrew text was ever affected by any wilful act of theirs, all that is known of their feelings towards the Septuagint will warrant the statement, that they availed themselves of all possible means for depreciating and adulterating its contents; and that, when at last they concluded to terminate their own inveterate controversy about the canon, it was decided that no book originally written, or extant then only in Greek, should be placed therein. Greek could expect no quarter among sages by whom, "Cursed is he that eatheth swine's flesh and teaches his child

Greek," was considered a venerable truism.[1] This insane detestation of Greek may account for the absence of Esther from the collection of books which Melito found among the Palestinian Rabbins in the middle of the second century.[2] Innumerable manuscripts must have perished in the ruin and desolation which, near the end of the preceding century, had fallen on their unhappy country. Among those manuscripts may have been copies of Esther not recovered at the time of Melito's visit, and of other books never afterwards restored. The Rabbins could, indeed, if they so desired, have had a Greek copy of Esther; but what Rabbin then would have been guilty of such impiety as the possession of that book would imply. A Hebrew copy of the book afterwards appeared among the rabbinical collection, but in so mutilated a state, as to convince the reader, after examining Esther's Greek history, that that copy had indeed passed through many perils, but not unscathed. The compass, therefore, assigned by the rabbinical doctors to their false canon was determined, to a certain extent, by their inveterate antipathy to the Greek language. But another cause which contributed to make that canon what it is, was the following: The true canon, as fixed long before, either practically or formally, by the High Priest, when he in either way approved the collection belonging to the Alexandrine version, had become unsettled or uncertain through the disregard of the constitutional method prescribed for his appointment, as well as through the usurpation of his spiritual authority by a class of men, whose true position was, and always had been, subordinate to that occupied by him, not only in the Temple, but in the tribunal where all questions relat-

[1] Milman, *Hist of the Jews*, iii. 83.

[2] Omission of Esther from the Jewish canon, in the time of Mileto, satisfactorily accounted for in ch. xii.

ing to religion, its rites, its doctrines, and its sacred books were considered and decided. If, therefore, as it is alleged, the rabbinical canon, on account of doubts involving Ezechiel, Esther, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, was not considered to be closed in the first century before, and the first century after Christ,[1] that was just what was to be expected. And if the Rabbins, after ages spent in doubting, debating, discussing, arguing, and wrangling about the matter, at last agreed on a canon which certainly was at variance with the uniform practice of Palestinians and Hellenists up to the time of Herod the Great, nothing else under the circumstances was to be looked for.

The rabbinical writers would have us believe, that their canon, from the time of Esdras and Nehemias, was always what it is at present. But that this is not so, is proved by the toleration, not to say approbation, which the Septuagint with all its contents enjoyed even in Jerusalem, and by the constant sanction which that version received from the Hellenists for over three hundred years. The rabbinical statement is further shown to be utterly unfounded by the following plain facts already stated in preceding chapter. In the second century after Christ, Melito could not find Esther in the Hebrew copies of the Scripture, which he examined in Palestine. But in the third century, Origen was able to say, that the Hebrew Bible had been enlarged by the admission of Esther, and the addition of Baruch. This latter book was still found on the Hebrew canon about 330, when Athanasius copied the Jewish catalogue. In 360 Hilary reported, that Baruch then still held its place on the rabbinical canon. And in 374 Epiphanius, enumerating the books belonging to that canon, included Baruch. But after that Baruch is no longer found among the number of Books received by the Jews.

[1] Davidson, *Encyl., Britt.* vol. v. 4.

For on the catalogue which Jerome wrote 6 years after, that is, in 380, Baruch is omitted, and the rabbinical canon is reduced to the dimensions which it has maintained from that time up to the present. All these Fathers, as is implied in their statements, proposed, in what they said about the canon, to enumerate simply those books which the Rabbins of their time had placed upon it. If, therefore, it were said, that it was about the beginning of the last quarter in the fourth century, probably at some date between 374 and 380, that the rabbinical doctors decided at last to lay aside their private opinions, and unite in declaring definitely what books were to be included in their bible, and received as canonical by their followers, that statement would be fully warranted by all the facts in the case.

As a conclusion to all of the preceding remarks, it may be observed here, that the principal subject considered therein, in fact, the only one to which they have been addressed, has been the canon of the Old Testament. The view maintained in these pages on that subject, as well as the reasons for holding it, are by this time sufficiently clear. If that view, which is comparatively a modern speculation, if not a novelty, be dignified by the name of a theory, then, in order to proceed systematically, it ought to be observed at this point, that there are principally three other theories which have been proposed for solving the many difficulties connected with the question before us, and which have come down to us with all the prestige which an existence of several centuries and the advocacy of many eminent Christian critics could impart. One of these theories (for, though all of them have already been noticed, here it is proper to dismiss them finally) is that which is generally held by Protestants; most of whom contend that their canon, that is the Hebrew canon, rather the rabbinical canon, for it is it they adopted,

was the work of Esdras the Scribe and the men of the great Sanhedrim, the last of whom, Simon the Just, died in 292. The manner in which the advocates of this theory express themselves would induce a credulous reader to suppose, that not the slightest dissent from this view has ever been manifested among Protestant writers. Yet from the first moment when a Protestant appeared, not an age has passed without recording numerous and vehement protests from Protestant writers against it. Even Luther's allusions to some of the books on the canon of the Old as well as of the New Testament are known to be so contemptuous, intemperate, and irreverent, that it is evident he refused to be bound by that canon. The man who scrupled not to say, "The Book of Esther I toss into the Elbe,"[1] could not have held that book to be divine, nor the canon that contained it entitled to any respect. And at this day there are many distinguished Protestants for whose religious creed Luther is responsible, but who think no more of several books on the rabbinical canon than he did of Esther.[2] And no wonder; that canon, as appears from the preceding pages, is open to so many grave, rather insuperable objections throughout, especially that part of its history extending from the first to the fourth Christian century, that to believe it contains now, and always did contain, since the generation to which Esdras belonged, all those divine writings which from the time of Moses to that of Christ have escaped the ravages of time, or that it contained always neither more nor less than it contains now, requires a degree of confidence in the honesty and competence of the custodians from whom Protestants received it to which those custodians are entitled neither by the ac-

[1] Kitto's *Cycl.*, *Esther.*

[2] Of Esther, as it appears in the rabbinical canon, Whiston says: "No religious Jews could well be the authors of it." Note on Jos. *Antiq.*, B. xi. c. vi. § 13.

count they have given of it, nor by the usurped relations into which they obtruded themselves when they laid their sacrilegious hands on God's written word. Besides, before the theory in question is accepted, he who would do so must be prepared to believe, like all others who have adopted that theory: first, that it was the Septuagint, with all belonging to it, and not the Hebrew with its limited and vacillating canon, which the Apostles delivered to the first churches. Second, that that same Septuagint, or versions of it, with its unmutilated canon, has ever since circulated throughout the East, as it did throughout the West until the sixth century. Third, that even when it was superseded in the West by a Latin translation of the Hebrew, that translation, as it circulated throughout the West, like the Septuagint, has always contained the deutero books. Fourth, that out of either, without any distinction between proto and deutero books, Missals, Breviaries, Lectionaries, Rituals, Sacramentaries, etc., were formed, and texts quoted for the instruction of the faithful. Yet, fifth, he must maintain that all this was wrong, the source from which these extracts were made being polluted by the admixture of what he calls apocryphal books, which even supplied some of the extracts in question; though the source itself, while containing these books, has been venerated for ages by the whole Church, and, so far as can be now known, actually consecrated by Apostolical sanction. Can any intelligent Protestant believe this? Yet he must do so, so long as he insists that his canon is right, and the Catholic canon wrong.

CHAPTER X.

Another Theory examined.

Another theory, of which the late Professor Ubaldi is the most recent advocate,[1] is, that neither the Palestinians nor the Hellenists had any other canon besides the Esdrine; but that that canon was left open, and afterwards enlarged, when by the authority of Christ and His apostles the deutero books contained in the Septuagint were added to it. This theory necessarily supposes that there was an Esdrine canon, that is, a catalogue of books approved as divine by Esdras and others soon after the return from Babylon; and its advocates contend, that that catalogue was the only one received as authoritative by the Jews up to and since the time of Christ. In these pages it has been argued already, that the formation of the Jewish canon was part of the duties with which the High Priest was charged, and that he, not Esdras, was to be regarded as the author of the canon. It is not, therefore, necessary to repeat here the reasons for which that position has been taken. That other part of the theory now under discussion, according to which the Jews, whether inside or outside Palestine, never had since the time of Esdras but one canon, that canon being the same which they have at present, remains to be considered. The reader, therefore, besides being asked to subscribe to the claims urged on behalf of Esdras, is expected to believe that the present rabbinical canon alone has been always

[1] *Introd. in S. Script.*, vol. II., Thesis liii.

followed by all Jews throughout the world. But how can he do so, knowing as he does, that the book of Esther was at one time not on that canon, and that Baruch, though generally omitted in it, is known to have once been included in it? Besides, he is more likely to be puzzled than convinced, if he contrast the propositions he is urged to adopt with the statements of its defenders, when as disinterested judges, not as ardent advocates, they pass upon the merits of the "Alexandrine version," which, says one[1] of them "although not properly inspired, was nevertheless not made without the special providence and counsel of God," and "hardly had it appeared, when it was immediately received by the Jews, and employed by them publicly and privately; nor did it remain within the limits of one country, for it was introduced to almost all countries where there were Jews, or where the Greek language was understood. Nor is it to be supposed that the Palestinians had less veneration for the LXX, as appears from Flavius Josephus and the hagiographists of the New Testament."[2]

Such, in general, are the unbiassed sentiments of those who maintain that from the time of Esdras the Jews have had no canon but that of which he is the reputed author. Nevertheless, it does not follow, so we are told by these same critics, that to express such sentiments is inconsistent with the opinion which they defend, as the Septuagint might well be all that they say it is, without the Jews ever having adopted its canon. Be it so, provided it be first proved that the Alexandrine version contained no other books besides those now found in the Hebrew Bible. But this is not possible. On the contrary, it can be easily shown, that, as far back as the dawn of the Christian era, and probably long before it, the contents of that version were as ample as

[1] *Ubaldi, Introd. in S. Script.*, Vol. I., *Thesis* xxvii., pp. 551, 552.

[2] Ibid. 557.

they are now, embracing, as they do still, several books not found in the Hebrew Scriptures.

Take for example the oldest Greek copies that are still extant, the Vatican, the Sinaitic, the Alexandrine, and the Parisian, and see what is implied by their contents. The Vatican, so called because preserved in the Vatican library at Rome, is assigned to the beginning or middle of the fourth century. The Sinaitic, which derives its name from Mount Sinai, on which stands the monastery where it was found, is supposed to be almost if not fully coëval with the Vatican, and was brought to St. Petersburg, where it still remains. The Alexandrine is so named, because written at Alexandria; it probably belongs to the fifth century, and is preserved in the British Museum. The Parisian is deposited in the national library at Paris, and is known as *Codex Ephremi rescriptus*—Ephrem's rescript or palimpsest—because in it the works of S. Ephrem had been written over the original, which contained the Old and New Testament books, only a few fragments of which have been restored, in the attempt made to remove what had been written over them; the manuscript is supposed to date from the fifth or sixth century.[1]

Now, all these codices, although more or less mutilated, exhibit unmistakable traces of the deutero books. In fact, these books in all of these manuscripts are found not added at the end, nor prefixed to the beginning, nor intruded all together between some two proto books, but inserted, some here, some there, between the other books. Thus the Vatican has *Judith* and *Tobias*, between Esther and Osee, *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus* between Job and Esther, and *Baruch* between Jeremias and Lamentations; the two books of *Machabees*, however, as well as the greater parts of Genesis with several books of the New Testament, are now wanting in

[1] For contents of each Codex see *Appendix*.

it. The Sinaitic is also characterized by the distribution of the deutero among the proto books. The Alexandrine has *Baruch*, although not mentioned in the pre fixed index, between Jeremias and Lamentations; *Tobias* and *Judith* between Esther and III. Esdras (apocryphal); then *Machabees*, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*. The Parisian has, among fragments of some proto books, those of *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus* after what remains of Canticles. In other fragmentary codices all the deutero books, or at least *Tobias* and *Judith*, and very often *Machabees*, mutilated or otherwise, are intermingled with the proto books, *Baruch* being joined to Jeremias. But it is to be observed that the Vatican, Alexandrian, and Sinaitic have III. Esdras, which in them is marked I. Esdras, and that the Alexandrian and Sinaitic, besides I. and II. Machabees, have III. and IV. Machabees. These apocryphal books, although some of them were regarded with favor by a few Fathers, were never publicly read in the Church. But as they came down from a remote antiquity, contained nothing absolutely objectionable, and were withal of some value, they were probably allowed a place in some codices, as the best way of consulting for their preservation—the very reason why the Church has permitted the Prayer of Manasses and III. and IV. Esdras to be retained in many copies of the Vulgate.

The same intermixture of deutero and proto books exists in all the ancient versions derived from the Septuagint; the Ethiopic, and no doubt the Gothic, of which latter but a few fragments remain, and both of the fourth century; the Armenian, of the fifth century; the Syriac Hexaplar of the Seventh century, and the Slavonic, of the ninth.[1] It is therefore certain, that as at present,

[1] Catalogues belonging to most of these versions may be seen in Hody, *de Bibl. Text.*, p. 650.—2.

the Septuagint, whether in its original Greek dress, or as it appeared in the various versions prepared for Christian nations speaking other dialects, has always contained the deutero books distributed among the proto, as far back as the fourth century, and, according to incontestable testimony, even farther back than that. For the *vetus Itala*, or old Latin Vulgate, another version of the Septuagint, and, as we have seen, [1] coëval, it may be said, with the Christian Church, also exhibited this intermixture of proto and deutero books; a clear proof that its author, as well as its readers, placed both classes of books on the same level, in point of authority. This remark applies to all the other versions; and when it is remembered that those versions were prepared not only for individuals, but for the churches throughout Christendom, it will be understood how much is implied in that fact.

But no Christian interpreter, working in the interest of a Christian community, would have dared to add to his version books not found in the original, or mix such books among those of which he professed to give a Latin translation, For that original was well known and widely circulated among those for whose use his own work was intended. In the catalogues of the versions referred to above, so far as known, the order of the books from Genesis to the end of Kings is the same. But from Kings to the end of the collection the order is varied. This difference may have arisen from the fact, that, while the order in which the books from Genesis to Kings appeared, was well known, the order in which the other were written was not ascertained. Besides, variations in Greek copies, on which the translators worked, may have led to the same result.

It is clear, however, that at the moment when the Old Testament passed into the possession of the Church, or

[1] Supra, p. 79, &c.

rather she was sufficiently organized to take charge of it; the Septuagint had the same characteristics which it presents to-day—in addition to the books on the present Hebrew canon several more, and these indiscriminately mixed among the others. This was at the time of the apostles. Now, by whom were these books added to the canon, for added they were then, for the first time, if the theory now on its trial be correct? "Why! by the apostles," answer the advocates of that theory. Impossible; for, while we know that the apostles were called before the counsel, reprimanded, scourged, and imprisoned, put to death on various pretexts by the Jews, we have yet to learn from anything contained in the history of the time, that they were ever accused by the Jews of adding profane and foreign compositions to the collection of divine literature, or of attempting to substitute for the then authorized canon another of their own creation. Besides, throughout the whole of the New Testament not a word is written warranting a suspicion that between our Lord and his apostles on the one hand, and the Jews on the other, there was any difference of opinion about the canon. So far as known, both parties followed the same canon. There is absolutely nothing to show the contrary, but much, very much, to refute it. And when the proper time comes for equipping the Church with a true and complete copy of the Old Testament, the apostles, as the defenders of the theory before us admit, set the seal of their sanction on the Alexandrine canon, without a word of complaint or protest from any sect or party among the Jews. Is it not clear, that that canon was the one, which the Jews themselves were then and had been following, for a long time before?

Finally, let us now note briefly the course of events in the Christian Church at Jerusalem, from the time when St. James, the first of the fifteen Bishops who succeeded

him in that See, all being of the circumcision, [1] was put to death, until about the middle of the second century; when we learn for the first time, through Justin Martyr, that the Jews had repudiated some of the scriptures contained in the Alexandrine version. These events have something to do with the question before us, and therefore deserve attention. In the year 62 James suffered martyrdom by order of the High Priest Ananus and the Sanhedrim.[2] He was succeeded [3] by S. Simeon, probably a younger uterine brother, who, with his flock, immediately before the commencement of the siege, withdrew from the city to Pella, a town beyond the Jordan.[4] After the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, a Roman governor was established in the place.[5] Meantime many of the Jews, profoundly impressed with the misfortunes of their country, convinced that their cause as a people was hopeless, and believing, perhaps, that the Mosaic dispensation was in the order of Providence to be superseded by Christianity, had attached themselves to the flock of Simeon. The country seems to have been still densely populated, and the veneration which they cherished for the site of the ruined city, as well as the prospect of gain by supplying the wants of the garrison stationed there, soon attracted to it a considerable number of Jews, too powerless, however, to excite in the minds of their haughty conquerors any other feeling than that of contempt. Among those who returned were St. Simeon and his flock, now greatly increased, but, as the future proved, embracing elements which boded no good to the cause of the infant Church.

Still, amidst much opposition and persecution, there was reason to rejoice on account of the large number of apparently sincere converts who had recently professed

[1] Euseb., *Hist.*, B. iv., c. 5.

[2] Ibid., B. ii., c. 23; Jos., *Antiq.*, B. xx., c. ix., § 1.

[3] Euseb., *Hist.*, B. iii., c. xi. [4] Ibid., c. v.

[5] Joseph., *Wars*, B. vii., c. i., § 1.

their belief in the doctrine of Christianity. But in a few years it became evident that many among them, though outwardly conforming to the Gospel, insisted that the law of Moses was still in force, while others were infatuated with the system developed by Philo of Alexandria out of the Greek Philosophy, and not a few adhered to the peculiar views advocated by surviving Jewish sects, as the Essenes, Nazarites, Pharisees, etc., the number of these being increased by others of more recent origin, Ebionites, Elkessaites, Nicolaites, etc.,—all these comprising in a great measure that formidable, seething mass known as Judaizing Christians, among whom Thebutis, a disappointed aspirant to the succession on the martyrdom of St. James, was the most prominent, restless, and of course dissatisfied spirit.

An order had already been made by Vespasian and Domitian that all of the race of David should be put to death. It was renewed by Trajan; and Simeon, after having for some time evaded the vigilance of the persecutors, was at last betrayed into their hands by the Judaizing Christians, whose vengeance had probably been stimulated by his zeal against the false teachers who endeavored to corrupt the faith of his flock. The venerable Bishop, after being condemned as a descendant of David, and above all as a Christian, was in 107 or 116 subjected to horrible tortures, which he bore with the greatest constancy.[1] Then being nailed to a cross, he expired thereon, confessing Christ with his last breath. While he lived, his influence as that of one who had seen the Lord, his authority as an apostle, and his vigilance as a pastor succeeded to a great extent in defeating the attempts which renegade Christians, whether Jews or pagans originally, made to corrupt the creed which he

[1] See for all this Butler's *Lives of Saints*, *Feb.* 18; Alzog, *Universal Church History;* Pabisch and Byrne, vol. i., c. 5; Hermion, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, vol. i., p. 127; Rohrbacher, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, vol. v., p. 9, etc.

taught. But his successor Justus, possessed of less prestige, was not so well qualified for a position surrounded with such peculiar difficulties. And Palestine then became, and for long after remained a hot-bed of heresies a parallel for which will be sought in vain until the sixteenth century is reached.

With the names of these heresies, their principles or their founders, we have nothing to do. But it is worthy of remark that, while the professors of these heresies were constantly broaching new errors, denying less or more of the Christian creed, counterfeiting or repudiating one or other part of the Christian Scriptures, they neither assailed nor repudiated as such any of the deutero books. Thus Simon Magus, followed by the Marcionites and Manicheans, held that the Law was framed, not by God, but by a certain malignant intelligence. He also taught that the prophets were inspired, not by God, but by various intelligences, and that all who believed the Old Testament would incur death. Saturninus said that the prophecies were uttered partly by angels, who made the world, and partly by Satan. Basilides declared that the prophecies were made by angels, but the law by the prince of the Jews. The followers of Cerinthus repudiated the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul. The Ebionites also rejected the Epistles of St. Paul, and all the Gospels except that of St. Matthew. All these impious theories, remember, were broached about or soon before the end of the first century, and if the inquiry be pushed only a little farther in the direction of the present, it will be found that the disciples of these or other early heretics condemned the Psalms as a collection of vulgar lyrics, and, like some of the Rabbins in the first century, excluded Ecclesiastes and Canticles from the canon.[2]

[1] The ancient authorities on the subject are principally the *Eccl. Hist.* of Eusebius, the *Panarium* of Epiphanius, and the *Liber de Hæres.*, of Philas-

Now it is for those who contend that the deutero books were never on the Jewish canon to say how it happened that, while so many books belonging to the Old and New Testament were condemned by these early heretics, nothing unfavorable was alleged by them regarding the deutero books. It will not do to say that they were ignorant of their existence, or that, being ruled out of the canon by all, nobody thought it worth while to notice or protest against them. For many of those heretics, being familiar with Greek, must have known that they were contained in the Septuagint; and that, while they themselves were blaspheming against this or that proto book, the author of the Epistle of Barnabas, and Clement of Rome in his letters to the Corinthians, and Clement of Alexandria in his works as well as other Fathers in their writings, were appealing to the authority of the deutero books, as if it were equal to that of the proto. It seems, therefore, that no explanation of the course pursued by these early heretics regarding the Scriptures is satisfactory, that does not include the deutero among the canonical books. Of course, when a heretic is met with who rejected the whole of the Old Testament, it must be admitted that the deutero books also were covered by the impious condemnation; but when, as was generally the case, the condemnation extended only to certain specified proto books, others as well as the deutero being always, as a matter of course, excepted, the conclusion must be, that when among these heretics the existence of a canon was admitted at all, the deutero books were considered a part of it. But from whom did they receive a canon of Scripture? From the Jews, or the Christian Church, is the only answer. Then, if from the Jews, the theory now under discussion must be abandoned. If from the

trius. Among the modern works on the subject are Liguori's *Hist. of Heresies; Eccl. Hist.* of Noel Alexander.

Christian Church, then it must be remembered, that many of these heretics were originally Jews; but how did it happen that after apostatizing from Christianity, while opposing what they considered its errors and defects, they never charged it with having placed on the canon several books entitled to no such distinction? The only conceivable answer to this question is, as it seems, that these renegade Jews had found among the Christians the same canon which they themselves had followed before they, whether sincerely or otherwise, professed their belief in Christ as the Messiah. That the Jews before and at the time of our Lord had a canon, no intelligent Christian can deny. But that that canon contained only such books as are embraced in the present Hebrew Bible, there is no good reason for believing; on the other hand, there are, as we have just seen, several weighty considerations which render it extremely probable (indeed it might be said all but certain) that the only canon the Jews had, from the time when the last of the deutero books was approved by the High Priest until some period within the second Christian century, comprised not only every one of the books which they still retain, but all those others preserved in the Septuagint and declared canonical by the Council of Trent.

CHAPTER XI.

A Third Theory Reviewed.

Besides the theories just discussed, one other, which like the preceding is defended by some Catholic writers, remains to be considered. It numbers among its advocates several distinguished scholars, the latest of whom is Rev. Rudolph Cornely, S. J., Professor in the Gregorian University, Rome, and the author of a learned Introduction to the Sacred Scripture. According to this theory [1] there were among the Jews two canons: one, the Palestinian or Esdrine attributed to Esdras and Nehemias, not closed until the time of the apostles, restricted to Palestine, and until closed containing only the proto books; the other, the Alexandrine or Hellenistic, followed outside of Palestine, and comprising the deutero as well as the proto books. So far as this theory insists on the existence of a distinct Palestinian canon, embracing none but the proto books, its merits have been so fully treated in connection with the preceding theory, that any further remark on that subject here is quite unnecessary. But something must be said in relation to the other view involved in it, that the Jews had at the same time two canons, the Palestinian and Alexandrian, although the point has been already touched upon [2] when it was shown that, while the Hellenists made use of the Septuagint, and as a consequence followed the Alexandrine canon alone, they en-

[1] Cornely's *Introd. in S. Script.*, vol. pp. 39 seq., 50 seq., Parisiis, 1885.

[2] Chapters v. & vi.

joyed religious communion with the spiritual rulers at Jerusalem, and were treated there by these rulers, as if, so far as religion was concerned, they differed in no respect from their Palestinian brethren.

Who, therefore, does not see, that, if the canon of the Hellenists was not the same as the one approved at Jerusalem, they differed from their brethren there in a matter so intimately related to the fundamentals of Judaism, that they must have been considered schismatics, been excluded from the temple, and denied all religious fellowship by the High Priest and his council? It is admitted by all Biblical scholars, that there was no part of their religion which the Jews treated with more profound veneration, or guarded with greater care, than their holy books. Josephus' remark is a simple statement of a well-known fact, when he says that, "it becomes natural to all Jews, immediately and from their very birth, to esteem these books to contain divine doctrines, and to persist in them, and, if occasion be, willingly to die for them. For it is no new thing for our captives, many of them in number, and frequently in time, to be seen to endure racks and death of all kinds upon the theatres, that they may not be obliged to say one word against our laws and the records that contain them."[1] Now, this would be a mendacious boast, and the jealous vigilance with which the Jews are universally believed to have preserved their sacred records from corruption and profanation would be nothing more than an idle legend, devised for the purpose of corroborating the rabbinical romance, according to which the canon was the work of Esdras, and not the result of the authority lodged in the office of the High Priest, had the Hellenists been permitted, as they really were, to parade the Septuagint with its intermixture of deutero books in the very precincts of the temple of Jerusalem, while these books were branded as

[1] I. *Contra Apion.*, 8.

unscriptural by the supreme spiritual authority of that city. But confess that these books formed part of the canon for the Jews everywhere, and this glaring anomaly disappears.

But in reply to this it is said that, if notwithstanding the positive command of God through Moses, the erection and maintenance of the temple in Egypt by and for the service of the Jews there settled was tolerated, and those who frequented it were allowed to worship in Jerusalem and treated there as brethren, might not the use of a canon different from that approved in Palestine have been also permitted to those Egyptian Jews? This hypothetical surmise has been already disposed of.[1] It is therefore not necessary to say anything more on the subject beyond the single remark that, since the Egyptian temple was outside the territory covered by the Mosaic ordinance, its erection was not a violation of that ordinance, especially as it was the creation of an actually legitimate High Priest and was intended to provide for the spiritual wants of an immense multitude of Jews. In conclusion, let it be remembered that the worshippers at Leontopolis, as is admitted by those who believe in the theory of a double canon, used not only there, but at Jerusalem with the knowledge and consent of the supreme central authority in that city, a copy of the Sacred Scriptures containing the deutero intermingled with the proto books, that is, the Alexandrine canon. Then say, does it not seem to follow, that that canon, and that canon alone, had at the time the sanction of the priestly as well as the lay element among all the Jews, whether residing inside or outside the limits of Palestine?

And now a last word as to the connection which Esdras the Scribe is said to have had with the origin of the Hebrew canon. It is evident from what has been already

[1] Chapters v. & vi.

said on that subject, that, though the rabbinical tradition, which attributes the canon to Esdras as its principal author, has been generally credited so far as the substance of that tradition is concerned; it proves, when confronted with the Scriptures and the uninspired works of Jewish as well as of Christian writers, to be by no means satisfactory; and is in fact contradicted by the Hebrew constitution itself, as framed by Moses in the book of Deuteronomy, and referred to in other books of the Old Testament written subsequently. That constitution, as we have seen, so long as the Hebrew commonwealth existed, provided a certain and well defined method for distinguishing between sacred and profane compositions. And no tradition, however venerable in other respects, that is invoked for the purpose of superseding that method is entitled to any consideration. In fact, what the Rabbins say about the relation of Esdras and the men of the great Sanhedrim to their canon is simply one of their many legends, and is misnamed when called a tradition, for such it is not in the theological sense attached to that word. For example, the substitution of Sunday, as a day consecrated to the service of God, by the founders of the Christian religion, for Saturday, the day so sanctified among the Jews, is a tradition; but essentially different not only in its object but in its nature from the one in question. Thus the former is invested with the characteristics of universality and perpetuity. For it is clearly discernible in the customs of all Christendom, in the laws of all Christian nations, in the belief of all Christian people, in the writings of theologians, in the sermons of preachers, in the exhortations of ascetics, in the canons of councils, in the decrees of Popes, etc., away back through all ages, from the present to that of the apostles, who, although they left no written rule enjoining the change, are rightly believed to have made it. Whereas the latter, intensely

local and suspiciously late, is never heard of outside rabbinical circles, till it appears in the Talmud, a work replete with fables and absurdities; not a word of which had been written until at least some six centuries after the time when, according to the story, Esdras had executed the task with which he is credited by the Jews.

In concluding these remarks on the origin and compass of the Old Testament canon, it is pertinent to transcribe here the following statement by a writer, whose opinion on that subject is entitled to the greatest respect. "Authority to establish a canon of sacred books without doubt belonged to the High Priest of the Hebrews after consulting the elders and the Sanhedrim, for, if it was the duty of the High Priest and priests to judge between leprosy and leprosy (Lev.xiii.), indeed, if it was the duty of the High Priest to decide any controversy concerning the law, when any doubt had arisen (Lev. xvii.), without doubt it belonged to him also to establish such a canon of divine books, since this matter was the most important of all; so that it is not remarkable, that also in the Church the authority to establish a canon of this kind has resided in one pontiff, either with or without a council." [1]

Is it not remarkable, that a view so reasonable, so consistent with the Mosaic legislation, and so well calculated to solve all difficulties connected with the canon has not been more generally embraced? And that most (it might be said all) of those who have discussed that question, whether they hold that until the time of Christ the Jews had but one canon, or two, overlook the fact, that according to all the evidence on the case the canon now used by the Jews, and known as the rabbinical because invented by the Rabbins long after they had

[1] Jacobi Bonfrerii *Præloquia in totam Scrip. Sacram*, cap. iii., § vi.; Migne, *Cur. comp. S. Scrip.*, Tome I., p. 12.

rejected the Messiah, is quite different from the one which the Jews followed in pre-Christian times, whatever that one may have been?

CHAPTER XII.

Testimony of Flavius Josephus, the Jewish Historian.

That the deutero books were never in any way recognized by the Jews as entitled to a place in the canon, is maintained by many Christian critics, in consequence of a statement by the Jewish historian Josephus. The works of this writer are now in such a condition, that it is not always an easy matter to ascertain the genuine text. Besides, it is admitted that, whether discussing matters pertaining to the Jewish religion, or dealing with historical subjects, he is not always to be trusted. Nor does it appear that, though as a Pharisee he belonged to one of the strictest sects among the Jews, his general course was influenced more by a sense of duty than by the baser dictates of human policy. The Jewish priest (for such he was) who, when directed by Vespasian, hesitated not to marry a captive woman, thus knowingly violating the law of Moses, must have had little regard for his religious principles or personal honor; at least not so much as for the favors which it was in the power of his imperial patrons to bestow. It is true that priests were not forbidden to marry a captive woman;[1] but Josephus, following the construction put upon the Law of Moses,[2] probably by the Pharisees, has twice said[3] that priests were not permitted to contract such a marriage. This much by way of introduction to the following extract from the Jewish historian.

[1] *Life*, § 75.

[2] Lev. xxi. 7, 14.

[3] *Antiq.* B. iii., c. xii., § 2; I. *Contra Apion.*, 7.

"For we have not myriads of discordant and contradictory books, but only two and twenty, containing the record of all time, and rightly believed to be divine. And of these, five are the books of Moses, comprising the laws, and the tradition of the human race down to his death.' This period was a little short of three thousand years. But from the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes, King of Persia, who succeeded Xerxes, the prophets compiled the history of their own times in thirteen books. The other four contain hymns to God and counsels of life to men. But from Artaxerxes to our times all events have indeed been written down; but these later books are not deemed worthy of the same credit, because there has been no exact succession of prophets."[1]

This is the earliest notice we have, that the books received by the Jews as divine amounted to 22, a number fixed upon, not because there were actually so many sacred Hebrew books, or authors of these books, for that could not be proved, but because, as Origen[2] was the first to remark, there were 22 letters in the Hebrew alphabet. As we have seen already, these books were sometimes also reckoned 24 or 27, the Hebrew letters being in either case so arranged that the number of books corresponded with that of the letters. So that this correspondence would, no doubt, have been preserved, had the rabbinical doctors been able to devise a good reason for augmenting the number of books, say, to 50. Indeed, if the number of books were to be determined, not by the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet, but by the number of distinct treatises on the rabbinical canon, or by the number of authors whose writings find a place in that canon, there is no reason for supposing that the result would be 22, 24, or 27. By such an arbitrary enumeration as the one adopted by the

[1] I. *Contra Apion.*, § 8. [2] Euseb., *Hist.*, B. vi., c. 25.

Rabbins, it would be easy to show that the Christian canon of the Old Testament, embracing 45 books, might be reduced to 22 or even less. This number 22 has been the cause of more confusion and discordance among Christian writers in regard to the canon, than any other fiction manufactured by the Rabbins while expatiating on that subject.

All who, in arguing that the Jews had never any canon but the imperfect one which they have now, appeal to the authority of Josephus as evidenced in the preceding extract, appear to regard it as unquestionable that Josephus meant to say, that the Jewish canon as it existed in his time was exactly similar to that now followed by the rabbinical teachers and their Protestant pupils; or, if it be too absurd to say that Josephus, writing in the first century, foresaw what canon the Jews would follow in the nineteenth, that the canon described by Josephus is identical with that now followed by Jews and Protestants. But this interpretation of Josephus' statement is false, absolutely false, for three reasons: First, because Josephus has described no canon, nor named a single book, nor named the author of any book or books, Moses and his books alone excepted. He has really said nothing in his statement which would justify any one in concluding, that, with the exception of the five books of Moses, any one of his 22 is now found in the rabbinical canon. Second, because we have seen,[1] that from some time before Josephus wrote until far in the fourth century, the Hebrew canon was not what it is at present. And third, because a strict construction of the words of Josephus, such as every writer should be bound by, will show not only that the conclusion generally drawn from his statement is unwarranted, but that he meant to say that several, if not all, of the deutero books were included in the 22 believed to be divine. For, if

[1] Supra, ch. ix.

the 22 books contain, as he says they do, "the record of all time," they must contain the record of the entire period from the creation to the time when Josephus wrote. Now, as the rabbinical canon includes only such books as deal with events which transpired between the creation and the time of Malachias, the author of the latest[1] book in that canon, the compass of the Flavian 22 books must be much wider than that of the canon indicated. May it not therefore be concluded that those 22 books included such as were contained in the Septuagint, but omitted in the Hebrew copies current among the Rabbins?

The only possible reply that can be made to all this by those, who contend that the statement of Josephus proves that the canon in his time was the same as the one which the Jews have now, is that, as Josephus excluded from the collection of divine books all written after the reign of Artaxerxes, and as the deutero books were not written until after that time, they were not counted by Josephus among the twenty-two. But this reply takes for granted two points, which cannot, but must be proved, before the identity of the present rabbinical canon and the Flavian collection can be admitted. These two points are: First, is it true that Josepus has excluded from his twenty-two books all written after the reign of Artaxerxes? Second, is it true that all the deutero books were written after the reign of Artaxerxes? Both questions may be met with an unqualified negative. For, first, judged by his own words "from Artaxerxes to our times *events* have been indeed written down," it is only *historical* books written after the time of Artaxerxes, that Josepus says "were not deemed worthy of the same credit," as those written before. The only books, therefore, excluded by Josepus as having been written after the reign of Artaxerxes are historical, and as the two

[1] Kitto's *Cyclop.*, art. *Malachi.*

books of Machabees are the only historical books known certainly to have been written subsequently to that date, these are the only two deutero books for which no place can be found in the Flavian canon, while the Flavian statement "not deemed worthy of the same credit, because there has been no exact succession of prophets" is not by any means inconsistent with the divine character of the two books in question, nor does it prove that Josephus himself regarded them as mere human compositions.

Second, it is not at all certain, that all the deutero books were written after the reign of Artaxerxes. Baruch was written long before. Whether Tobias and Judith were written before or after is a matter of doubt. Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and, as just remarked, I. and II. Machabees were written after. It is therefore certain that it is not true, that all the deutero books were written after the reign of Artaxerxes, while of those known to have been written after that time, Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, not being historical, were not, according to Josephus, excluded from the divine twenty-two. It does not, therefore, by any means follow from the statement of Josephus, that his twenty-two books constituted a collection identical with that contained in the existing rabbinical canon.

Moreover, Josephus says that "from the death of Moses until the reign of Artaxerxes the prophets compiled the history of their own times in thirteen books." It therefore follows, if Josephus be right, that the rabbinical canon was finished at a period not later than the reign of Artaxerxes. Is that so? Far from it, for it has been seen already,[1] that there are in some of these books statements which could not have been written before the time of Alexander the Great, that is, almost a century after the reign of Artaxerxes had closed. Josephus

[1] Supra, ch. iii.

may have written as he learned from the tradition of the Pharisees. But that he was mistaken in this matter there can be no doubt.

Mistaken also, very much mistaken, are those writers who, to use the words of Professor Smith,[1] declare that "we can affirm with practical certainty, that the twenty-two books of Josephus are those of the present Hebrew canon." For if this were so, the Flavian two and twenty would contain no more nor no less than what is contained in that canon. And critics, in enumerating the books supposed to have been referred to by Josephus, would not only follow the same order, but be able to show that each one of the twenty-two is identical with one in the Hebrew canon. All this would be the case were the Flavian collection, as most Protestant writers affirm, identical with the Hebrew canon, or what is the same, the Protestant Old Testament. But it is far otherwise. Of course, all critics are agreed that "the five of Moses" are the Pentateuch. But as soon as it is attempted to identify the other seventeen the discordance begins. Hody[2] finds in the Protestant canon a book corresponding to each of the Flavian thirteen, and believes that Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles are the other four mentioned by Josephus. Prideaux[3] fills the bill in a different way, for he follows a different order, and is unable to find room for I. and II. Paralipomenon among the Flavian two and twenty. Havercamp[4] proposes two ways of making the tally, each different from the two preceding, particularly in that he checks off the Flavian four books of hymns and counsels by Psalms, book No. 1; Job, book No 2; Proverbs, book No. 3; and Ecclesiastes with Canticles, book No. 4. Whiston strikes out for himself, by asserting that Baruch

[1] *Hist. of the Old Test. in the Jewish Church*, p. 149.

[2] *De Bibl. Text.*, p. 644. [3] *Connex.*, ii. p. 272. [4] *Josepus*, ii. 441.

is "canonical;" [1] that apocryphal III. Esdras instead of I. Edras was included in the Flavian twenty-two, and that I. Esdras and Canticles were never seen by Josephus. [2] Haneberg is of opinion, that the Flavian twenty-two did not include I. and II. Paralipomenon, Esdras, and Esther, but in this is opposed by Franzelin [3] and Cornely. [4] Danko [5] is unable to recognize Job as one of the Flavian two and twenty. It is therefore evident, at all events, that we cannot affirm with any certainty, practical or otherwise, that all of the Flavian twenty-two books are those of our present Hebrew canon.

But has not Josephus in the compilation of his works made use of all the books on the Hebrew canon? He has not, for all were not suited to his purposes. But suppose he has, though Whiston, as we have just seen, is confident that Josephus never even saw some of them, that does not prove that his twenty-two books are identical with those contained in that canon, unless those who say so can show that Josephus has not made the same use of certain other scriptural or quasi scriptural books, which are not on that canon, as he has of those which belong to it. But this they cannot do. For Josephus has actually copied the contents of several such books, without even hinting that they were other than divine. Thus, all who have read the works of Josephus are aware that the three first chapters of Book XI. of his *Antiquities* are composed almost from beginning to end of what he read in III. Esdras; that he has also incorporated in his *Antiquities* (Book XI., c. vi., § 4) Esther xii., and in the same work (Book XI., c. vi., § 6) the first letter of Artaxerxes contained in Esther xiii., and in *Antiquities* (Book XI., c. vi., § 12) the substance of the second letter of Artaxerxes, found in Esther xvi.

[1] Note Jos. *Antiq.*, B. x., c. ix., § 1. [2] Note Jos. *Contra Apion.*, B. i., § 8.
[3] *De Div. Tract. et Scrip.* p. 395. [4] *Introd. in S. Scrip.* i. p. 46.
[5] *In S. Scrip.* i. p. 18.

All these statements, remember, are contained, not in proto, but in deutero Esther. Besides many of the materials on which Josephus worked while engaged in the twelfth and thirteenth chapters of his *Antiquities*, the first Book of his *Wars of the Jews*, and his work *on the Machabees*, or *the Empire of Reason*, have been drawn from the deutero books of Machabees. All these Scriptures Josephus has copied without intimating in any way, that in point of authority he considered them inferior to the two and twenty divine books. It must, however, be admitted that, according to what he has said while writing *Contra Apion.* (B. i. § 8), Machabees, having been written after the reign of Artaxerxes, did not in his opinion deserve the same credit as the twenty-two books. But this cannot be said of Esdras III., which, although its age is unknown, deals with events which preceded the reign of Artaxerxes, and for that reason seems to have been used by Josephus, who, there is every reason to believe, included it among the twenty-two.

That Josephus really included III. Esdras among the twenty-two books believed to be divine is, however, rendered extremely probable only by the use he has made of it, and the date of the events which it describes. But in addition to these two reasons, which also hold with regard to deutero Esther, there is the further fact that Joseph ben Gorion, a Jewish writer of the ninth century, has included deutero Esther in his Jewish history.[1] These considerations will at least warrant the conclusion that that part of Esther was well known to Jewish scholars, and treated by them as belonging to the authentic records of their race. But there is another argument, which, besides confirming this conclusion, renders it certain, so far as certainty is possible in such matters, that deutero Esther was considered divine by the Jews before and in the time of Josephus. This argument will now be submitted.

[1] B. ii., c. 2. (Calmet, *Prolegom. in Librum Esther.*)

The reader is aware that, Esther of the Protestant Bible from beginning to end, and Esther of the Catholic Bible from the beginning to the end of verse third, chapter tenth, are substantially identical, both being translations from the Hebrew, the former by King James's theologians, the latter by St. Jerome. At the end of verse third, chapter tenth, the Latin Vulgate has a note by St. Jerome, stating that all of the book which preceded that verse had been translated by him from the Hebrew, and that what followed that verse he had found in the old Latin version made from the Greek, and made, as we have already seen, in the infancy of the Church. It thus happens that verse third of chapter X. is followed by ten more verses, thus completing that chapter, and by six more chapters. All these St. Jerome, because he did not find them in the existing Hebrew, removed to the end of the book, wrenching them from the places they held in the old Latin version, and still hold in the Greek, where, however, they present a continuous and well connected narrative. In order that this may be better understood, here is shown the manner, in which the Greek Esther, of which the old Latin was a version, has been arranged in the Vulgate left by St. Jerome.

Greek.	Vulgate.
Chapter I.	Chapter XI. 2–12; XII. 1–6.
" II.	" II.
" III.	" III. 1–15; XIII. 1–7.
" IV.	" IV. 1–8; XV. 2–3; IV. 9–17; XIII. 8–18: XIV. 1–19.
" V.	" XV. 4–19; V. 3–14.
" VI.	" VI.
" VII.	" VII.
" VIII.	" VIII. 1–13; XVI. 1–24; VIII. 14–17.
" IX.	" IX.
" X.	" X. 1–13; XI. 1.

Now, in the Vulgate Esther, the first verse of chapter XI. is the subscription appended at the end of the Greek

Esther, by some Alexandrian Jew, in which it is stated, that, "in the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemy and Cleopatra, Dositheus, who said he was a priest, and of the Levitical race, and Ptolemy his son, brought this epistle of Purim, which they said Lysimachus had translated in Jerusalem." This subscription is found in the end of the Alexandrian as well as the Vatican Codex, and imports that the Book of Esther, or, as it is here called the "Epistle of Purim (lots)[1] with its deutero as well as proto parts, as they are preserved in the Septuagint, after having been translated into Greek at Jerusalem by a certain Lysimachus, was brought to the Alexandrian Jews by one Dositheus, a priest, and his son Ptolemy, in the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemy and Cleopatra. In this inquiry it is a point of some interest to ascertain what Ptolemy is here meant. But this is not so easily done, as Ptolemy was a common name for the kings of Egypt, and the wives of at least five of them, who reigned between 205 and 43 B. C., were called Cleopatra. Whatever Ptolemy is meant, it is evident, however, from the subscription that there was no attempt at the time to obstruct the intercourse which the Jews of Jerusalem were always anxious to maintain with those of Alexandria, and that the latter had reason to regard as a friend the Ptolemy then reigning, while their treatment by many of the other Ptolemies was too often cruel and oppressive. There is, in fact, but one Ptolemy whose character and relations with his Jewish subjects correspond with the presumption suggested by the subscription. That is Ptolemy Philometer, who first reigned conjointly with his mother, Queen Cleopatra, during his minority, and afterwards with his wife Cleopatra, from 180 to 146 B. C. He was a prince of a humane, generous, and tolerant disposition, and is said to have conferred many favors on the Jews, by whom he

[1] Esther ix. 26, 32.

with his army, while marching through their country to Syria, was well received, he in turn presenting many valuable gifts to their High Priest Jonathan.[1] Besides, he appears to have felt considerable interest in the Jewish Scriptures; for Aristobulus, a Jew who had lived about the same time, a priest, probably one of the LXX interpreters, and it may be the same to whom the Jerusalem Jews wrote an epistle,[2] is said to have prepared for him a commentary on the Laws of Moses.[3] Furthermore, it was Ptolemy Philometer who, with Queen Cleopatra, permitted Onias, the fugitive successor to the high priesthood, to erect a temple in Egypt, and adjudicated the dispute between the Jews and the Samaritans, each party maintaining that its own temple alone was sanctioned by the Law of Moses.[4] Josephus[5] also states that two Jews, Onias and Dositheus, the former perhaps the founder of the Judæo-Egyptian temple, the latter, it may be, the same who, possibly under the auspices of Ptolemy Philometer, brought the Greek Esther to Alexandria, were placed by that prince and Queen Cleopatra in important military positions, to the signal advantage both of the country and the royal family.[6] As to Lysimachus, the interpreter, who translated Esther from Hebrew into Greek, with, remember, all its deutero parts, as stated in the subscription to the Greek Esther, it is known that in the early part of the reign of Ptolemy Philometer the High Priest at Jerusalem was named Lysimachus,[7] and was there killed in an insurrection in 171 B. C. But whether he was the same Lysimachus with him to whom we are indebted for the Greek copy of Esther cannot be said, although his age,

[1] I. Mach. xi.; Jos., *Antiq.*, B. xiii., c. iv., § 5.

[2] II. Mach. i. 10. [3] Euseb. *Prep. Evangel.*, B. VII., c. xiii.

[4] Jos., *Antiq.*, B. XIII., c. iii., § 1-4. [5] II. *Contra Apion.*, § 5.

[6] In 89 B. C., Cheleias and Ananias, sons of Onias, were in command of the forces of Queen Cleopatra. Jos., *Antiq.*, B. XIII., c. x., § 4.

[7] II. Mach. iv. 29, 42.

his position, and his knowledge of Greek, as implied in his Grecian name, would render the supposition plausible. But whatever may be said of the preceding conjectures, there is no reason to doubt, that the Ptolemy of the subscription is Ptolemy Philometer, and in this conclusion almost all critics, Protestant as well Catholic, are agreed. So that the Greek Esther, with all its deutero parts, must have been brought into Alexandria about 177 B. C., and as it had been translated at Jerusalem before that, it must have been known to the Jews there. And since it is certain that it, as soon as received at Alexandria, was enrolled among the other Scriptures by the Jews who were there settled, it follows that it was considered part of their Old Testament by the Jews of Jerusalem; otherwise the former would not have placed it among the divine books. It was, besides, known to and used by Josephus. And since, as we have seen, he has incorporated its contents in his works, without making any distinction between those portions common to it and the existing Hebrew copy on the one hand, and what the former has and the latter has not on the other, he must have considered that the entire book, as he found it in the Septuagint, was divine, and therefore a part of the twenty-two which the Jews received in his time.

These facts prove that Esther, deutero as well as proto, was in the Jewish canon in 177 B. C., Lysimachus having before that translated it into Greek for the use of the Hellenists, and that it was still on that canon when Josephus wrote in the latter part of the first Christian century. Indeed, all Protestant critics contend that proto Esther was one of the Flavian twenty-two divine books, and Catholic critics are very generally of the same opinion, though not unanimous, in holding that Esther as it stood on the Hebrew canon comprised the deutero portion of that volume. But it has been shown, that about the middle of the second

century Esther, whether proto or deutero, was not one of the sacred books in the possession of the Palestinian Jews, and that after having been lost or discarded for some time, it was found again on their canon, with, however, an aspect so wordly, and in a condition so mutilated, that a Protestant writer is forced to confess that "no religious Jews could well be the authors of it."[1]

These vicissitudes which the book of Esther has experienced among the Jews are thus accounted for:[2] From the time that the feast of Purim, as directed in Esther,[3] was observed by the Jews, the book was read in the synagogues on the day appointed for the purpose. The celebration at first was probably conducted as a religious solemnity at which all assembled, not only to hear the inspired account in which the providential deliverance of the Jews from the murderous plot of Aman was described, but to return thanks to God for the protection then extended to his people. But the festival, from being an occasion of pious joy and thanksgiving, became by degrees a day of dissipation and revelry, and its yearly recurrence only served to show that the feast of Purim, though in its origin calculated to foster devout and patriotic sentiments among the Jews, only tended as time went on to excite their worst passions, and encourage among them bacchanalian orgies under the sanction of religion. It was the custom for the whole congregation, when the name of Mordechai occurred in the reading of Esther, to exclaim *Blessed be Mordechai;* and when they heard the name of Aman pronounced, to say *May his name perish*, at the same time stamping with their feet, clapping their

[1] Whiston, Note on Jos. *Antiq.*, B. xi. c. vi. § 13.

[2] Vide Cornely, *Hist. et Critica Introd. in V. T. Libros Sacros.* Volumen II., ii., 407, who, with other Catholic writers, in this matter follows J. B. de Rossi.

[3] Esther ix., 27, etc.; x. 13.

hands, hissing, and pounding the walls and benches with stones or mallets. Plays and masquerades were indulged in. Notwithstanding the prohibition of Moses,[1] each sex assumed sometimes the dress of the other, and it was lawful to drink to such a degree that the worshippers, unable any longer to discriminate between Mordechai and Aman, showered blessings upon, or hurled curses at either indiscriminately.[2] Now the Greek Esther, which undoubtedly is identical with the Hebrew Esther at the first appearance of the latter, is an edifying book, as much so probably as any other of the historical books in the Old Testament. The efficacy of fasting and prayer is well exemplified therein; sorrow for sin is feelingly expressed, and God's holy name is often reverently mentioned, his power magnified, his mercy extolled, and his protection earnestly invoked in it. To read such a book, under such circumstances as were connected with the celebration of the feast of Purim, must have presented an awful spectacle to devout Jews, and nothing less than a profanation to such among them as still believed that Judaism of any kind was far superior to the highest form of refined paganism. At least so the Rabbins seemed to think. For, after having at first excluded Esther from the canon either actually or practically by forbidding the reading of it, they afterwards restored it to the canon, but so changed that it could be read at the feast of Purim without shocking the devout feelings of the more religious who shared in the celebration. Possibly it was not in the power of the Rabbins to correct the gross abuses which disgraced the occasion. At all events, Theodosius II. seems to have been the first to institute measures for that purpose, when, in order to prevent the violent and indecent scenes often witnessed at the time of Purim,

[1] Deut. xxii. 5.

[2] Prid., *Connex.*, i., 263; Kitto's *Cycl.* (Purim); Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, iii. 36.

an imperial decree [1] was made on the subject. This was in the fifth century. But Esther had already been withdrawn from and restored to the Hebrew canon, after having been so mutilated that amidst the excesses of Purim it could be very appropriately read. It thus happens that any one may peruse the Hebrew Esther from beginning to end without even once meeting with the holy name of God, the Rabbins having carefully excluded from it all those sections in which any reference is made to the Deity, that it might be thus adapted to the style in which the feast of Purim was kept. Although, therefore, not justly chargeable with corrupting the sacred text, all the circumstances go to prove that they have been guilty of mutilating the contents of the sacred volume.

[1] *Codex Theodos.*, xvi., *De Judæis*, (l. 18: Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, vol. iii. 36).

CHAPTER XIII.

Further Remarks on the Testimony of Josephus.

Some remarks remain to be made on the last clause in the statement of Josephus, before a correct estimate can be made regarding the value of his testimony, so far as that testimony relates to the deutero books. The clause in question is "From Artaxerxes to our times, all events have indeed been written down, but these later books are not deemed worthy of the same credit, because there has been no exact *succession* of prophets." It is not necessary here to engage in any explanation of the functions performed by the prophets, as the subject is fully discussed in vol. IV. of Migne's *Cursus Scripturæ*, A Lapide's *Proem to the Prophets*, and Calmet's *Prolegomena to the Prophets*. Let it therefore be observed at once, that the word *succession* in the above clause is ill-chosen, being misleading and incorrect. For it implies that prophet succeeded prophet, as regularly as high priest followed high priest; that the position occupied by the prophets, instead of being an intermittent gift immediately bestowed by God, was a permanent office, vacancies in which were filled by right of inheritance, or some one of the methods employed in such cases; and that from Moses, rather Adam, to Artaxerxes there had been an uninterrupted line of prophets, just as there had been a regular series of pontiffs from Aaron to the fall of the Temple. Strange would it not be, had the succession of the prophets, at

least as inspired writers, for the word in its less restricted sense included such, been closed so long before that of the high priests? For writers of that class were hardly less necessary after than before the reign of Artaxerxes. Besides, Josephus' "succession of prophets" sadly disturbs the picture which the Scriptures, and even he himself, have drawn of those remarkable characters, who issued forth from time to time to give their contemporaries a glimpse of the future, and thus reveal to a sinful generation the certain chastisements that awaited its misdeeds. They were called by God for special purposes, and under exceptional conditions. And when each of them disappeared, the mission which he filled might or might not, according to circumstances, be filled by another called forth in the same way. There were periods in which the labors of the prophets seem never to have been interrupted; such was that from the reign of Ozias, King of Juda, till about the closing years of Nehemias, an interval of about three hundred years. Of these prophets there were seventeen, Osee being first and Malachias last. Several of them lived at the same time, and the prophetic utterances of each are contained in a book which goes by his name. But there were times when there was no prophet to be found, and regarding which to use the word *succession* would be an abuse of language. For, from Josue to Samuel, a period of three hundred years, the only person who is mentioned as possessed of the prophetic spirit was Debora.[1] In the early part of Samuel's career there could have been no prophet, "for the word of the Lord was precious in these days, there was no manifest vision;"[2] and when the three children were surrounded by the flames of the fiery furnace, among the many national calamities which they deplored, was the want of a prophet.[3] The *succession*,

[1] Judges iv. 4. [2] I. Kings iii. 1. [3] Dan. iii. 38.

therefore, mentioned by Josephus may be classified among the vain traditions of the Pharisees, though, if the Rabbins are to be believed, there was such a succession from Adam to Malachias.

Lest, however, Josephus may have been misinterpreted in the preceding remarks, let us, for the sake of argument, agree with Walton,[1] that the Jewish historian discredited all books written after Artaxerxes, simply "because they were not written by prophets, or men divinely inspired;" or let us accept the only other construction that can be put on the Flavian clause, "because it is not certain that there were any prophets after the time of Artaxerxes." If the Waltonian interpretation be correct, how, it may be asked, did Josephus know, that of all books belonging to dates subsequent to Artaxerxes not one was written by a prophet or a man divinely inspired; that, while the book of Ruth, for instance, was the work of some such author, that of Judith was not? No High Priest, no Prophet, no Council, no inspired writer has declared that the Sacred Scriptures were all written between the time of Moses and the reign of Artaxerxes, or that books written after were less authoritative than those written during that interval. If, therefore, the Flavian clause means what Walton says it does, the allegation contained in that clause rests on no authority other than Josephus himself, a writer whose testimony on other points cannot, as all admit, be always reconciled with the authority of the Old Testament, even when he professes to follow it. Besides, as interpreted by Walton, the statement of Josephus would imply, that books among the Jews, after Artaxerxes, were no longer written by prophets, or men inspired; a conclusion which, though a Jew may insist on, a Christian cannot grant. For it is certain that even in Old Testament times, and four full centuries after

[1] *Proleg.* iv. 5.

the death of Artaxerxes, the *Benedicta tu* of Elizabeth,[1] the *Magnificat* of Mary,[2] and the *Benedictus* of Zachary,[3] all profoundly prophetic utterances, were pronounced by persons filled with the same Holy Spirit by whom the ancient prophets were enlightened.

If Josephus intended to say, that there were no prophets after the reign of Artaxerxes, or even that it was uncertain whether there were any prophets after that time, he is contradicted by himself, by the inspired writers of the New Testament, by Philo, and the Talmudic and rabbinical doctors. By himself: for he says of the High Priest John Hyrcanus: "he it was who alone had three of the most desirable things: the government of his nation, and the high priesthood, and the gift of *prophecy*, for the Deity conversed with him, and he was not ignorant of anything that was to come afterwards;"[4] that, "God came to discourse with him," and that when "he was alone in the temple, as high priest offering incense," he received a divine communication, which on coming out of the Temple he announced to all the people, and which proved to be true.[5] Such communications were made through the breast-plate worn by the High Priest, but, according to Josephus, ceased two hundred years before he wrote his *Antiquities*,[6] that is, one hundred years before Christ, but long after the time of Artaxerxes. Judas the Essene was also another prophet, and one "who never missed the truth in his predictions."[7] So were Pollio[8] and Manahen,[9] both of whom lived as late as the time of Herod the Great. Even as late as the time of Josephus there were some who undertook "to tell things to come . . . . and it is but seldom that they miss in their predictions."[10] In fact, so far were the Jews from admitting that the

[1] Luke i. 42. [2] Ibid. 46. [3] Ibid. 68. [4] *Wars*, B. i., c. ii., § 8.
[5] *Antiq.*, B. xiii., c. x., § 3. [6] *Antiq.*, B. iii., c. viii. § 9.
[7] Ibid., B. xiii., c. xi., § 2. [8] Ibid., B. xv., c. i., § 1. [9] Ibid., c. x., § 5
[10] *Wars*, B. ii., c. viii. § 12.

gift of prophecy had been withdrawn from them after the reign of Artaxerxes, that it seems that in the time of Herod the Great the Pharisees "were believed to have the foreknowledge of things to come by divine inspiration." [1] Josephus is, therefore, contradicted by himself. And his contradiction of himself is confirmed by those numerous statements in the Books of Machabees, from which it appears, that during the period included in these Books the miraculous occurrences and divine manifestations, by which the whole previous history of the Jews had been signalized, had by no means ceased.

But Josephus is also contradicted by the writers of the New Testament, and in fact must be contradicetd by all who believe in that inspired volume. For, according to those whose writings are contained in it, Zachary "prophesied," [2] his wife "Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost," [3] and her youthful cousin Mary at the same time, in saying "Henceforth all generations shall call me blessed," [4] uttered a prophecy the literal fulfilment of which has been in the past,and will be in the future witnessed in every age. This prophesying took place, too, while the Jewish Church was still standing; and before Christ was born. After that glorious event it is said of Simeon that "the Holy Ghost was in him. And he had secured an answer from the Holy Ghost.... And he came by the Spirit into the temple," [5] where he recognized the Child Jesus, and foretold the future not only of that Child but of His Mother Mary, Anna the "prophetess" being also present on the occasion. Indeed, it is certain that if Josephus meant to say, that after the reign of Artaxerxes prophets and prophesying ceased, he expressed an opinion directly contrary to that held by the Jews generally, for the whole people were per-

[1] *Antiquities*, B. xvii., c. ii., § 4.

[2] Luke i. 67. [3] Ibid. 41. [4] Ibid. 48. [5] Ibid. ii. 25.

suaded that John the Baptist, for example, was a prophet.[1] Josephus wrote as taught by the Pharisees. But even they seem to have thought it possible for a prophet to rise except in Galilee.[2] And St. John, who reflected the belief of conscientious Jews better than Josephus or any Pharisee, appears from his Gospel (xi. 51) to have thought that Caiphas the High Priest, even when engaged in a wicked conspiracy, actually "prophesied." During the life of Our Lord, therefore, prophets were not wanting. Nor did they cease after that, as the Apostolic writings amply testify. Agabus, for example, is called a "prophet"[3] and proved himself such by foretelling what really happened afterwards to St. Paul. Indeed, he had already shown that he was entitled to the name when he "signified by the Spirit that there should be a great famine over the whole world, which came to pass under Claudius." That there were at the same time other "prophets" is declared in the preceding verse; and Adam Clarke, a Protestant commentator, in his note on it declares, that they "were under *divine inspiration*, and foretold future events." Had he studied the lives of the post-apostolic saints with the same care and freedom from prejudice, he could have easily found evidence to prove, that the prophetic spirit possessed by the Church in the beginning was not withdrawn from her.

Josephus is also contradicted by Philo, the Alexandrian Jew, born probably not long before the Christian era. For, describing the origin of the Septuagint, the latter says,[4] that the interpreters were divinely inspired, having every word throughout the version dictated to them by the Holy Ghost. What bearing this must have on the testimony of Josephus will be understood when it is remembered that the Septuagint was made more than a century after the reign of Artaxerxes, and at least three

[1] Luke. xx. 6.
[2] John vii. 52.
[3] Acts xxi. 10; xi. 28.
[4] *De Vita Moysis, lib.* II.

full centuries before Josephus wrote. It is not necessary to add, that what Philo has said regarding the influence, under which the Septuagint was written, was believed by several of the early Christian Fathers.

It is also in evidence, that if Josephus meant to say that after the reign of Artaxerxes there were no prophets, or that it was uncertain whether there were any such, he is contradicted by the Talmudic and rabbinical writers. But before proof of this is submitted, a word or two must be said about the belief of these writers regarding prophecy. They distinguish a great many grades of prophecy, but these distinctions are often so finely drawn as to escape the grasp of ordinary intellects. And in fact they may all be reduced to three, as is done by Duvoisin,[1] on whose statements the following remarks are based. The three grades of prophecy, as described by rabbinical writers, are prophecy by the Holy Ghost, prophecy by Urim and Thummim, and prophecy by Bath Kol—daughter of a voice or daughter voice. In all of these grades the Rabbins make several distinctions, which simply indicate the various ways in which divine communications may be made in each grade. The first and highest grade is by the Holy Ghost, such as Moses was favored with, who while awake perceived the revelation in his mind without angelic intervention, not enigmatically but clearly, and unlike other prophets remaining unaffected by horror, undisturbed by terror, and unassailed by languor, and speaking as a friend with a friend, and being invested whenever he wished with the Holy Ghost, and constantly possessed of the prophet's gift.[2] The next highest grade of prophecy is that by Urim and Thumim, the breast-plate worn by the High Priest, by looking on which he was enabled to receive divine revelations. Maimonides[3] has described the

[1] *Observat. in Pug. Fidei* Raymundi Martini, 101, 102.

[2] Maimonides *in Tract. De Fund. Legis*, c. 7.

[3] In *Jad Chazakah*, book on vessels of the Sanctuary, c. 10.

manner in which the High Priest prophesied by Urim and Thummim. He also in the same place says that these two grades of prophecy ceased in the time of the second temple; although the Urim and Thummim were used therein to complete the vestments worn by the High Priest, but not for the purpose of receiving in this way communications, because the Holy Ghost was not there. The third and lowest grade of prophecy was called by the Jews Bath Kol—daughter of a voice, or daughter-voice,—and took the place of the other two grades, when they had ceased after the erection of the second temple. Duvoisin[1] cites several rabbinical writers in order to explain what is meant by it. Thus one[2] says, that it is not a voice from heaven, but one proceeding from the midst of such a voice, as happens for instance when a person, after a strong blow on something, hears from a distance a sound from a sound thus produced. And another[3] says that, according to the belief of R. Moses, it is Bath Kol, when a man is possessed of such a vivid imagination that he thinks he hears a voice outside his soul. Such, R. Moses believes, was the visitation accorded to Hagar, and Manoah[4] with his wife, none of whom was a prophet; but the word which they heard, or which came into their mind, was like Bath Kol (of which our sages make mention), which is of such a nature that it can happen to one not prepared for prophecy. Again, sometimes the divine will is not manifested to man, neither by prophecy nor by a prophet, but by divine inspiration, such as the inspiration of Abigail, that she should go forth to meet David. David himself knew that the inspiration was divine, for he therefore said: *Blessed be the Lord the God of Israel, Who sent this day to meet me.*[5] In fine, Ubaldi,[6] appeals to such Jewish

[1] p. 102. [2] *En Israel ad Tract. Talmud.*

[3] R. Schemthob, C. 42, T. 2, *More Nebochim.*

[4] Nabal, here named from Maon where he lived.

[5] I. Kings xxv., 32; *Sepher* Ikkarim. [6] *Introd. in S. Script.*, ii. 428.

writers as Juda the Levite, author of the book of Cozri, written more than ten hundred years ago, to Maimonides, Bechai, Abarbanel, etc., to prove that, after all other grades of prophecy had ceased in the second temple, as the Jews say, Bath Kol continued and was really divine inspiration. Prideaux[1] ridicules Bath Kol, comparing it to the divination practised among the heathen, and endeavors to prove his opinion by citing one of the many fabulous incidents with which the Talmud abounds. But he forgot that the incident is dated after, not before the birth of Christ, and consequently that the communication in question came, if it came at all, from Beelzebub, not from Bath Kol.

It thus becomes evident, that according to the Jewish writers there were several grades of prophecy, and that what was spoken or written by a prophet was more or less authoritative, according to the kind of inspiration with which he was favored. For this reason the writings of Moses were of the highest authority, and treated with a degree of respect not accorded to those of other prophets, which were considered of less authority, as emanating from a lower grade of prophecy; while writings which owed their origin to the mysterious influence exercised by Bath Kol were not considered worthy of the same credit as those of the two preceding classes, but yet could not be excluded from the collection of sacred writings, because like them they had been after all supernaturally dictated. And just as writings of the second class were still divine, though not considered worthy of the same credit as those of the first, so writings of the third class—generally the result of communications made by Bath Kol,—were also still divine, though not deemed worthy of the same credit as those of the second. Possibly this may have been what was meant by Josephus, when he said that books written after the

[1] *Connex.*, ii., 215.

reign of Artaxerxes were not deemed worthy of the same credit as those written up till that time. However this may be, the supposition seems warranted by the fact that, as we have seen, he has made the same use of the former as he has of the latter. It may be that Josephus was induced to express himself as he did in reference to the prophets, because he believed that after the reign of Artaxerxes there were no prophets so eminently such, as those who appeared before that time, as Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, etc., who under the most extraordinary circumstances were commissioned by God to awaken the piety of His people, and announce the calamities that would befall them as a nation, unless they repented of their iniquities. If this was the meaning of Josephus, he was no doubt correct, for it must be admitted that after the time specified no prophet appeared whose vocation was attested by such ample credentials, or rendered so necessary by the conditions of the times, as that of those whose mission immediately preceded and continued to the end of the captivity. In this case the statement of Josephus would be quite consistent with the divine origin claimed for the deutero books. For no one pretends, at least it cannot be shown, that even all the proto books were written by prophets of this eminent class, or authors inspired in the same way and to the same degree, since to write some of these books it certainly was not necessary that the authors should have been able to predict future events, or to have been prophets in the strict sense of the word, but solely that they should have been moved to write, and while doing so, guided by the Holy Ghost. If therefore a prophet inspired, but unable to forecast the future, could write a divine book before the reign of Artaxerxes, why should not a prophet of the same class have been able to write a divine book after that time? What was possible before was possible after that

date, and Josephus has said nothing to the contrary.

But let it be supposed that those who advocate the contracted canon of the Old Testament are correct in interpreting the words of Josephus, yet it is evident that his testimony, so far as it is unfavorable to the deutero books, is of very little account. For as a confessed Pharisee,[1] being a member of a sect whose doctrinal and moral principles were condemned by our Lord,[2] he cannot be regarded as an authorized and reliable exponent of the belief commonly held by the Jews. It will not do to say, with some who, without any positive proof, hold that the twenty-two divine books of Josephus are those at present on the Jewish canon, that the Flavian statement, which is supposed to exclude the deutero books from the collection of divine writings, involves a mere matter of fact, on which Josephus is competent to speak; and that his testimony on the point is admissible, even though his religious belief was not in all respects identical with that of his more orthodox countrymen. For that statement, whether or not it involves a matter of fact, deals with a question of doctrine, that is, whether certain books, regarded very generally in the time of Josephus and ever since as strictly canonical, were, when Josephus wrote, commonly so regarded among the Jews, a point which has to be taken into account in passing judgment on these books. The position of Josephus in the case under consideration is exactly that of Eusebius,[3] when, referring to the Epistle of St. James, he stated that "it is considered spurious." This statement of Eusebius, like that of Josephus, might be regarded as involving a mere question of fact, but like that of Josephus it also involves a question of doctrine, namely, is the Epistle of James spurious? All admit, however, that Eusebius was mistaken as to the doctrine as well as

[1] *Life*, § 2.

[2] Matt. v. 20; xvi. 12; xxiii. 13–35.

[3] *Hist.*, B. ii., c. 23.

the fact. Might not the same thing have happened to Josephus?

But it may, perhaps should, be admitted that Josephus, though in error as to the doctrine, was right in regard to the fact, if he merely intended to express the belief entertained by the rabbinical doctors of his own age. For it is well known that, when he wrote, the profound veneration in which the Jews had formerly held the Greek version was being superseded by a feeling of abhorrence—a consequence of the success with which their Christian adversaries employed that version, and especially its deutero books, which laid hardly less stress on practices almost distinctively Christian, as celibacy, almsdeeds, angelic ministrations, mortification of the senses, prayers for the dead, works of penance, etc., than did the New Testament itself. "These books," says a learned contributor to the Dublin Review,[1] in a rapid survey of the principal points connected with the present controversy, "were in all probability a part of the Jewish canon, but the Jews perceived that they were paving the way for Christianity and dropped them." Danko[2] is of the same opinion, but thinks that "it is impossible to say at what time the Jews excluded from their canon those additional books contained in the canon of the Catholic Church." The time, however, when the Jewish teachers decided on taking this step, was, as we have already seen, towards the close of the first or about the beginning of the second century. For, even before that time the progress of the Church had been such as to excite alarm and provoke bitter opposition on the part of the Synagogue, an opposition which had already cumulated in the martyrdom of Stephen and in a great persecution at Jerusalem, and had armed Saul with a commission from the High Priest to proceed to Damascus, and there arrest and drag to Jerusalem all the

[1] Vol. xxi., p. 150. [2] *De S. Script. ejusque interpret., Comment.*, p. 34.

Christian Jews he could find. Under these circumstances is it unreasonable to suppose that, as the destruction of every copy of the Septuagint—the Bible generally used by the Christians—was not possible, means were soon taken to bring discredit on that version, as one of the principal elements in the rapid spread of the new religion? Its texts could not be corrupted by its enemies, neither could they to any extent stop or restrict its circulation. But they could say, it did not fairly represent the original, and this they did say. They could also mutilate the sacred roll of books in their own possession, then solemnly decide that all the portions thus lopped off, but still adhering to the Septuagint, were apocryphal. And where is the honest critic who, after carefully weighing all the circumstances, will venture to say that they did not do so?

That they did do so, the remarks already made in connection with the testimony of Josephus leave no room to doubt, and the conclusion thus reached is further confirmed by Justin, born probably about the beginning of the second century. For in his dialogue with Tryphon the Jew,[1] he accuses the Jewish teachers, first, of contradicting *the interpretation of the seventy Elders* who had translated the Hebrew Scriptures, second, of *lopping off from that interpretation many Scriptures*, adding that he knew those *scriptures were denied by the Jews;* that he would make no use of such lopped off Scriptures in the matter under discussion, but would meet Tryphon on his own ground, by quoting only such Scriptures as the Jews admitted. Then being challenged by Tryphon to mention some of the Scriptures which had thus been lopped off, he produced as proof of his statement a few texts establishing the divinity of Christ, the point he was then arguing with Trypho. Evidently his charge against the Jewish teachers is so direct and sweeping,

[1] § 71.

that though, in answer to Trypho's challenge, he considered that charge proved by referring to only a few texts bearing on the question at issue, but which the Jews had misinterpreted, it implies that he believed the Jewish teachers guilty, not merely of misrepresenting the sense of single texts, but of having eliminated entire books and portions of books from the sacred volume.

It therefore follows, that the Synagogue, perceiving that the rapid diffusion of Christian principles, not only in Judea, but wherever Greek was spoken, was due in a great measure to the use that was made of the Septuagint, and observing that the doctrines inculcated in the deutero books found their logical development in the Christian Scriptures, concluded at last in self defense to withdraw the sanction or toleration all along enjoyed by the Alexandrine version and all that version contained. Thus that version, so long used for private devotion and the liturgical services of the Synagogue, was at last anathematized; and as a Greek translation had become necessary for almost all Jews, whether in or out of Judea; the Septuagint was soon supplanted among them by other translations in the same language, enjoying rabbinical sanction and generally devoid of all those objectionable books, of which all Hebrew copies had been carefully withdrawn, or which had been originally written in the unlucky but inevitable language of the Greeks.

Such action, finally consummated at a time when the light, which had so long guided the High Priest of the Old Law, had been already transferred to the High Priest of the New, with a flame not only brighter, but inextinguishable, could bind no one but those who consented to be bound by it. But from that day to this, not one of the deutero books has ever been found on the Hebrew canon, or considered worthy of a place thereon by a single rabbinical writer.

By the time that Josephus wrote, though both he and

Philo cited the Septuagint even where it differs from the Hebrew,[1] the opposition to the Alexandrine version had probably been commenced by the Jewish teachers. Among the various plans adopted by them for suppressing that version, at least among their own people, was the declaration that, as Professor Smith has observed, it was a sin to read its deutero books,[2] and no doubt the further declaration, that books written after the reign of Artaxerxes were not so worthy of credit as those written before. So that the remark of Josephus about the former class of books may be true, if intended to apply to the opinion taught by the rabbinical doctors of his own age; but it by no means expresses the practical belief which prevailed among them during the whole previous period, in which the Alexandrine version, with all its contents, was universally used by all Jews who understood Greek, whether in or out of Palestine. For from nearly three centuries before, and until far in the first century after the birth of Christ, by these same doctors, as we have already seen, that venerable version was tolerated if not approved in Jerusalem as well as in Alexandria, and, indeed, wherever else Greek was the only language in which the Jews could read or understand the Scriptures. Had not Professor Smith good reason for asserting, when speaking of "the Rabbins of Palestine," that "Their tradition, therefore, does not conclusively determine the question of the canon"?[3] Yet he is forced to confess, "that the early Protestants, for reasons very intelligible at their time, were content simply to accept the canon as it came to them from the Jews,"[4] the principal reason being, because "the Reformers and their successors, up to the present time, when all our Protestant versions were fixed, were for all purposes of

[1] Walton, *Prolog.*, ix. 37.

[2] *The Old Test. in the Jew. Church*, p. 154.

[3] Ibid., p. 147. [4] Ibid.

learning in the hands of the Rabbins."[1] Who will say that in this case the two parties—the Rabbins and the Reformers—the teachers and the pupils, were not well paired? But what a confession! Can anything be conceived more disgraceful or humiliating than the position, in which the Reformers thus placed themselves? How the crafty Rabbins must have chuckled, when they succeeded in imposing their own mutilated canon on their Protestant dupes!

[1] Ibid., 44.

CHAPTER XIV.

The Canon among the Schismatical Greeks.

We have next to inquire what canon has been adopted by schismatics. By schismatics are here meant the members of those religious communities which, unlike many ancient and modern sects, profess generally the creed, and practise the religious worship approved by the Church, but are excluded from her communion, because they refuse to recognize the supremacy of the Pope, and persist in maintaining that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone, or that the Redeemer has but one nature, or one will, or a double personality. It is to be observed, however, that schism, which is a rupture of communion with the visible head of the Church, leads sooner or later to heresy, the sin committed by those who reject one or more of the doctrines taught by the Church. So that the schismatic, if not a heretic in the first instance, usually becomes such in the end. But as the word is here applied it designates the great body of the Greeks, the Jacobites, the Copts, the Abyssinians, the Nestorians, the Armenians, and the Russians, most of whom; while professing almost all the doctrines of the Church; now, in consequence of the change in their creed, refuse to hear the voice of her chief Pastor. Among several of them the work of conversion from paganism to Christianity commenced in the first century. Among all of them, except the Russians, who were not brought into the Christian fold until

the ninth century, the cross was planted not later than the fourth century. Along with the Gospel, they all received the Old Testament as contained in the Septuagint; which had been current among the Hellenists; and even at least tolerated, if not approved, by the Palestinians, for three full centuries before the apostles delivered it to their converts; or if not in the actual Septuagint, in versions from it into the various languages spoken by these converts. And as kingdom after kingdom took its place in the Christian commonwealth, it was at once supplied with a copy of the Septuagint, or such a version thereof as would bring to the knowledge of its people the divine truths which the Septuagint contained. Thus the copies of the sacred Scripture distributed from the beginning throughout Christendom contained all those books found on the Tridentine canon, the only exception being that Syriac version called the Peschito, which, having been made from the Hebrew probably in the first century, if not before, by a converted or an unconverted Jew, was adopted by the Christians of Syria. As a Syriac equivalent for the Hebrew Bible, it contained only such books as were extant in Hebrew, and therefore exhibited a less extended canon than that contained in the Septuagint. It comprised only the proto books, but it may well be doubted whether those, among whom it was current, believed that those books alone constituted the canon of the Old Testament. For it is well known that this Syriac version, before the time of St. Ephrem (d. 379), was enlarged by the addition of the books which the Septuagint had, but it had not.

It has indeed already been shown[1] that the Septuagint, when it was delivered by the apostles to the Christian churches, contained not only the books on the present Hebrew canon, but the deutero portions of the Old

[1] Chapters v., x.

Testament. In fact, along with the faith each nation received a copy of the Alexandrine version, or a translation of it, and no other, from those who were engaged in propagating the principles of the Gospel. And whether those who were so engaged were the apostles or their legitimate successors immediate or remote, this acceptance of the Alexandrine version, together with the Christian creed by all nations, till then pagan, continued up to the sixteenth century. Yet, while the faith was thus extending the limits of its empire in all directions, no authoritative voice was raised to warn the faithful that the copy of the Old Testament which all were using, East and West, contained anything but the genuine word of God, or that any book therein was less venerable, less scriptural, than what was contained in the Hebrew original.

What is here insisted on is admitted by the most eminent Protestant writers. But to put the matter beyond all doubt, it is necessary to produce here the testimony of some of these writers who have expressed themselves on the point now under consideration, though in doing so we may have, perhaps, to repeat some statements already made. Walton,[1] referring to the deutero books, says, that "the Church received these books with the rest of the Scriptures from the Hellenistic Jews." If from the Hellenistic Jews, it must have been by the hands of her founders, the apostles, several of whom, if not all, in their use of and in their relation to the Septuagint, were Hellenists. He has no doubt, that the Septuagint, in which the Christians were first introduced to these books, is the only one of the early Greek versions that has come down to our time. "The Septuagint," he remarks,[2] "as it was publicly used in the synagogues and the churches, and is still the only one read in the churches, is the only one

[1] *Prolog.* ix., 13. [2] Ibid., 19.

that remains at this day." And "this version (the Septuagint) was and still is in constant use, especially in the Greek Church."[1] Furthermore, "the Christian Church and her chief doctors, by whom the version of the SEVENTY was greatly esteemed, read it, or versions of it (the first Syriac alone excepted), publicly in the churches. It was it they publicly explained to the people; it was on it they commented; it was by it they crushed the heresies and errors of their day. It was it they illustrated in their writings; some of them, as was the case with St. Augustine, knew not even whether there was another version besides the Greek."[2] He further affirms,[3] that "the Greek Church, as it had no other from the beginning, has preserved the same (Septuagint) to the present time, nor even were it united to the Roman Church, would it have any other, as we have just learned from the principal writers of the Roman Church." The Greek Church here referred to is the schismatical. It has had all along the Septuagint and no other copy of the Scriptures, and it has it still. In admitting this, Walton grants all for which we contend, that the schismatical Greeks, from the time they became Christians, while they were united in communion with the Roman Pontiff, and since they separated from that communion, have at all times revered the deutero books as the word of God. We will see, as we proceed, that Walton's statement is proved by the solemn and reiterated decisions of the highest ecclesiastical tribunals among those schismatical Greeks.

But let us hear Prideaux, a writer whose pen was incapable of tracing a single civil word on those occasions, when his subject or spleen induced him to notice the "Romanists" or "Papists," as he usually designated the members of the Catholic Church. "The Evangelists and Apostles (says he), who were the holy penmen of

[1] Ibid., 35. [2] Ibid., 40. [3] Ibid., 56.

the New Testament Scriptures, all quoted out of it (the Septuagint), and so did all the primitive Fathers after them. All the Greek churches used it, and the Latins had no other copy of those Scriptures in their language till Jerome's time, but what was translated from it. Whatsoever comments were written on any part of them, this was always the text, and the explications were made according to it; and when other nations were converted to Christianity, and had those Scriptures translated for their use into their several languages, these versions were all made from the Septuagint, as the Illyrian, the Gothic, the Arabic, the Ethiopic, the Armenian, and the Syriac."[1] Little did Prideaux suspect that in writing thus he was condemning King James' Version, and commending the Vulgate of the "Romanists." For the Septuagint and all the versions made from it contained the deutero books; and the Latins, as well after as before Jerome's time, had no other copies of the Scriptures than those, which included these same books; whereas these books, after being first degraded in the English as well as in the other Protestant Bibles, were very generally flung overboard at last by the editors of these Bibles. This was at least logical, for the reformers could not well protest against the religion of their forefathers without rejecting the canon of Christian antiquity. Another learned Protestant[2] admits "that the only copies of the Scriptures in existence for the first three hundred years after Christ, either among the Jews or Christians of Greece, Italy, or Africa, contained these books (the deutero) without any mark or distinction that we know of." This is as much as to say, that for the first three centuries, throughout Christendom, or the greatest part of it, the faithful were allowed by their teachers to regard the deutero as of

[1] *Connexion*, part ii., p. 40.

[2] Dr. Wright, Trinity College, Dublin, Kitto's *Cyclop.*, art. Deuteron.

equal authority with the proto books. And it is certain, that until the sixteenth century no distinction had been made between the two classes of books, by any convention of ecclesiastics whose judgment any Christian was bound to respect. Professor W. Robertson Smith,[1] referring to the Septuagint, frankly confesses, "that it spread contemporaneously with the preaching of the Gospel through all parts of Christendom where Greek was understood." And let it be here observed that the Septuagint, containing, be it remembered, every one of the deutero books, has all along ever since been used "wherever Greek was understood." It mattered not whether the Christians, who were brought to the knowledge of God's written word through the medium of that language, admitted or rejected the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff; it was always the Septuagint as we now have it that circulated among them. They might object to this or that doctrine, this or that practice approved by the Latin Church. But as Christian communities, they never rejected a single book contained in the copy of the Old Testament used by that Church.

It is well known that the Roman See, as represented by its Bishop, and to which the entire East, until a portion of it was involved in schism, as well as the entire West looked for guidance, has, ever since its institution, ignored any distinction between the proto and deutero writings. This will be shown as we proceed. And it is well known, also, that in this matter there never has been any difference of opinion between Latin and Greek especially, whether united under the same Pastor, or constituting distinct ecclesiastical organizations. In fact, when, as was often the case, they met in council to adjust doctrinal or disciplinary difficulties, the canon of Scripture never appears to have provoked discussion, as if a common belief on the point rendered

[1] *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 33.

such discussion unnecessary. But when one of the parties by itself or both together believed that the time had come for an explicit declaration regarding the canon, it is worthy of notice, that what was taught at Rome on that subject was reëchoed at Constantinople. It was so in the seventh century, at the Council in Trullo,[1] when the Carthaginian canons,[2] one of which included the deutero Scriptures among the canonical books, were reaffirmed. It was so also in the fifteenth century, at the Council of Florence, where Latins and Greeks were, in the instructions prepared for the Jacobites, directed that the deutero as well as the proto books should be received as written under "the inspiration of the Holy Ghost." To the canon then proclaimed the Greeks have never since objected, although hardly had the Council concluded its labors, when they made their last plunge into schism.

The canon sanctioned at Florence was again affirmed in the following century at Trent, but with greater solemnity, because demanded by more urgent circumstances. But its publication called forth no word of protest or disapproval from the Greek schismatical Church, although efforts were made and frequently repeated since by the reformers and their successors to infect its hierarchy with their own spirit as well as their own errors. Prompted by curiosity, if not by a less excusable motive, Joasaph II., patriarch of Constantinople, early in the last half of the sixteenth century, sent Demetrius Mysias, a deacon, to Wittenberg, to learn the principles of Protestantism at its very birth-place.[3] He received from Melanchthon a Greek translation of the Augsburg confession, by Dolscius, who was a good Greek scholar, and, as a disciple, devoted to Melanchthon. Along with this document was a letter addressed by

[1] Beveridge, *Synodikon Can.*, vol., i. p., 158. [2] *Conc. in Trullo*, Canon 11.

[3] Alzog, *Manual of Church Hist.*, translat. by Pabisch and Byrne, Vol., iii., p. 463.

Melanchthon to the Patriarch and congratulating that dignitary, in that "God had preserved the Eastern Church, surrounded by enemies so numerous and so hostile, to the Christian name," and assuring him, that Protestants had remained loyal to Holy Writ, to the Synods and Fathers of the Greek Church, eschewing all the errors anathematized by it, and condemning the superstitious practices and idolatrous worship introduced by ignorant Latin monks. The Patriarch was therefore also requested not to pay attention to any evil reports which might reach him regarding the Protestants. However, the report of Deacon Demetrius on the state of religion in the hot-bed of German Protestantism must have convinced the Patriarch, that the adoption of its principles was not likely to improve the morals of his flock, for he returned no answer to the letter of Melanchthon.

Several years afterwards, 1573–1575,[1] the Tübingen divines Jacob Andrea and Martin Crucius, a proficient in Greek, undismayed by the failure of Melanchthon, sent by David Ungnad, an ardent admirer of the Reformation and representative of the Emperor Maximilian II. at the sublime Porte, a communication to the Patriarch Jeremias II. After some delay the Patriarch sent an answer emphatically repudiating the distinctive teachings of Protestantism, and calling upon those who believed them to adopt the doctrines contained in the Bible, the seven holy synods, the writings of the Fathers, and whatever the Church holds, be it written or unwritten. The intrepid divines rejoined in a letter of an explanatory and controversial character. To this the Patriarch replied, 1581, requesting his Tübingen correspondents to spare him any further annoyance, and entreating them to renounce principles at variance with Christian truth, and certain to excite the vengeance of

[1] Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, vol. i. p. 50.

Heaven against those who professed them. Eleven of the distinguished divines of Würtemberg undertook to renew the correspondence, but to their plan for a union between Greeks and Protestants the indignant Patriarch made no reply. The irrepressible Crucius, fondly hoping that his knowledge of Greek might make an impression on the obdurate hearts of the haughty Orientals, had translated into their language, for the special benefit of their religious teachers, as many Lutheran sermons as would fill four folio volumes. These were duly forwarded to the Patriarch. What was done with them we are unable to say. But the Greek Synod of Jerusalem (1672), after stigmatizing Calvin's system as pestiferous, and Luther's principles as the ravings of a madman, vehemently denounced the schemes of Crucius and the Tübingen fraternity as an insidious and impudent attempt at introducing among the simple Orientals a creed which the Greek Church abhorred as strange and heretical. [1]

[1] Kimmel, *Monumenta Fidei Eccl. Orient.*, Pars. i., pp. 330–733.

CHAPTER XV.

The Canon of Cyril Lucar and Metrophanes Critopulus Condemned by the Greek Schismatics.

Notwithstanding all their efforts to secure the encouragement or sympathy of the Greek schismatics, the Protestants, therefore, at the end of the sixteenth century found that their mutilatad canon of Scripture, as well as their other innovations, was not more likely to be tolerated at Constantinople than at Rome. Hardly, however, had the seventeenth century dawned on Christendom, when a man appeared who, as Protestants generally believed, was destined either to bring about a union between them and the Greeks, or divest the creed of Photius of all that rendered it unpalatable to the vitiated taste of Lutherans, Calvinists, Anglicans, and other sectarists who had recently protested against what they complacently called the corruptions of Rome. This man was Cyril Lucar, who was born in Candia, the ancient Crete, then under the government of Venice. The date of his birth is uncertain. But writers who have studied his history assign that event to 1568 or 1572. The milder rule under which the Candians lived, as compared with that of Constantinople and other places governed by the Turks, had probably attracted many learned Greeks, and thus placed within the reach of Cyril the means of acquiring at least an elementary education. To complete his studies he went to Padua, which also belonged to the Republic of Venice. Here as in his native island his preceptors were ardently

attached to that party among the Greeks, which was opposed to all reconciliation with Rome.

On leaving Padua Cyril visited Genoa and other points where Protestant principles prevailed, being everywhere greeted with a cordial welcome by the advocates of the Reformation, and inspiring them with the hope that he was a vessel of election for purging Greece of superstition, and providing its benighted people with evangelical religion. Bidding farewell to his many friends of the Protestant persuasion, he proceeded to Alexandria, where he was ordained priest by the Patriarch Melitius Pega, an uncompromising enemy of the Papacy. Cyril, after having been employed in various ways, and brought at least on one occasion into contact with the Jesuits, against whom he conceived an implacable hatred, was at last, on the death of Melitius, promoted in 1602 to the patriarchal throne of Alexandria. Elevated to this lofty position he decided on exercising his personal and official influence in the consummation of a project, which he seems to have long contemplated —the adoption of Calvinism in some form by the schismatical Greeks. With this object in view he opened a correspondence with Cornelius Von Hagen, Dutch ambassador at Constantinople, David le Leu de Wilhelm, a Dutch statesman, John Uytenbogaert, the Calvinist minister at the Hague, and George Abbot, Anglican archbishop of Canterbury. Abbot, at the request of Cyril, succeeded in inducing King James to admit to the University of Oxford Metrophanes Critopulus, a native of Berea, who, after studying there, was on his return to spend some time in Germany, in order to be fully equipped for assisting in the evangelization of Greece. The indefatigable Cyril, it seems, had, besides Metrophanes, several other young Greeks studying in Protestant universities,[1] and destined to take part in the labors of the same mission.

[1] Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, vol. i., p. 55.

In 1613, a vacancy having occurred in the See of Constantinople, when the Patriarch Timothy was driven into exile, Cyril was one of the candidates for the office, which was conferred by the Sultan on the highest bidder. But the deposed Timothy, having contrived to placate the Sultan by a more princely donation than Cyril was able to offer, was restored. The latter, however, had only a few years to wait for the coveted prize. For on the death of Timothy, Cyril was appointed his successor, in 1621. Possessed of the highest ecclesiastical dignity which the schismatical Greek Church could bestow, or the Sublime Porte confirm, Cyril determined to use all the influence which his position gave him, in order to revolutionize the creed of his wretched countrymen. In this he was ably sustained by the ambassadors of England, Holland, and Sweden at Constantinople. The English and Swedish monarchs, in fact, the whole of Protestant Europe, watched his movements with an interest which nothing but a common cause of the greatest importance could have evoked; and money was not wanting, when that commodity was in demand, to promote the success of the scheme to which Cyril had devoted his life. Cyril was soon enabled by his friends to establish a printing press in Constantinople, an advantage which rendered it easy for him to inoculate with his views all whom he could not reach with his voice. The prospect was almost as favorable as he or his patrons in England and Germany could desire. But there were circumstances which boded no good to himself or his cause. The Jesuits, who were present in Constantinople, charged with the interests of the Catholic Church, and protected by the French ambassador, opposed with all their influence the policy of Cyril; and a powerful party of Greek schismatics, when they understood the ultimate purpose of that policy, prepared to resist to the utmost the consummation of the aposta-

sy, in which he proposed to involve his unhappy country.

In 1628, however, the friends of Cyril contrived to have the Jesuits expelled from Constantinople, and he, now relieved of their annoyance, felt comparatively free to pursue his own course. Christendom was therefore astounded, in 1629, by the appearance of his "Confession of Faith," a work dedicated to Cornelius Von Hagen, Dutch ambassador to the Porte. A Latin translation of it was published the same year at Geneva, with the name of "Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople," as its author. There was no Christian creed with which it was identical, although it closely resembled Calvinism. Although no longer annoyed by the unwelcome presence of the Jesuits, Cyril, having now shown his hand, found that his troubles were constantly increasing. He had by his bold denial of doctrines, which they held sacred, excited against himself the indignation of the most distinguished persons belonging to his own communion. And he had every reason to believe, that the Turkish government, though treating with sovereign contempt his effort at engrafting Protestant tenets on the creed of the Greek Church, was not indisposed to suspect him of treasonable designs against the State. Deposed one day, perhaps to be restored the next by the influence of the Protestant ambassadors at Constantinople, or by a judicious use of money, the magic power of which on a Turkish official no one understood better than Cyril, that miserable man experienced hardly a day's peace after he had thrown off the mask.

At length, in 1633, the opposition among the members of his own Church became so violent, that he was deposed. And after an unsuccessful effort of Cyril Contari, Bishop of Berea, to purchase the succession, it was disposed of to Anastasius, Bishop of Thessalonica, for sixty thousand dollars. Cyril Lucar, however, was

soon restored by the Sultan on the payment of a still larger price, seventy thousand dollars. But the following year he was again compelled to vacate the patriarchate in favor of Cyril Contari, who had been defeated by Anastasius. As soon as Contari was in possession of the See, he convened a synod in which he anathematized Lucar as a Lutheran, and openly declared his own submission to the See of Rome, and his intention of sending Lucar a prisoner to the Pope. But Contari himself was soon deposed through the influence of those who still adhered to the fortunes of Lucar, who was restored in 1636. But the end of the latter, after having been five times deposed, with often the penalty of exile added, and five times restored, was fast approaching. Accused of inciting the Cossacks to plunder the town of Azoff, he was found guilty of high treason, and his enemies in June 1638 obtained from the Sultan a warrant for his execution. Arrested on the twenty-sixth of that month by the Janissaries, he was placed by them on board a boat, under the pretence of being carried into exile. Perceiving, when out of sight of land, that death, not exile, awaited him, he knelt and prayed earnestly. Then the executioners, having put the bowstring around his neck, completed their horrible task, and threw his body into the sea. It was picked up by some fishermen and restored to his friends, by whom it was decently buried. But the malice of his enemies did not cease with his life. They complained to the governor of the city, by whose order the corpse was disinterred and again thrown into the sea; washed on shore by the billows, it was again buried on one of the islands in the bay of Nicomedia. Such is a brief summary of what we have been told by two Protestant writers,[1] regarding the checkered career and tragic end

[1] Neale, Anglican minister, *Hist. of the Holy Eastern Church:* Kimmel, Licentiate of Jena, *Monumenta Fidei Eccl. Orientalis.*

of one of the most remarkable men, whom the Greek schism has produced.

Metrophanes Critopulus, after leaving England, spent some time among the Lutherans in Germany, and while there, at their request, he too drew up a confession of faith, which, like Cyril's, professes to be an exposition of the doctrines held by the Eastern Church. But as they contradict each other, one of them must be false. Indeed, both were proved to be so when that Eastern Church subsequently, through her synods, put forth her own Confession of Faith. The confession of Metrophanes is quite a treatise, being about ten times larger than that of Cyril. It leans towards Lutheranism, while Cyril's to a certain extent is Calvinistic, but neither represents the creed of any sect that ever existed before or since. Had Cyril and his disciple succeeded in introducing their doctrines among the Greeks, Greece undoubtedly would soon have been invaded by a swarm of sects differing from, but as numerous as those, which overran the countries plagued by Protestantism. Metrophanes, after parting with his Lutheran friends, returned to Greece, where he succeeded Cyril in the patriarchal See of Alexandria; of his subsequent career nothing almost is known beyond the remarkable fact, that, when in 1638 Cyril Contari, the patriarch, convened a synod at Constantinople to anathematize the errors of Cyril, the ungrateful Metrophanes joined with the said Contari and Theophanes, patriarch of Jerusalem, twenty-four archbishops, and many other dignitaries, in the condemnation of his unfortunate patron.[1] He had probably been convinced by the downfall of that patron, that there was no room in Greece for heresies imported from Geneva or Wittenberg.

[3] Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, vol. i. p. 53: Kimmel, *Mon.*, Pref. to Part ii. p. viii: Neale, *Hist. of the Holy Eastern Church*, vol. ii., pp. 459-461; Alzog, *Manual of Universal Hist.*, iii. 467

Cyril, among his other errors, had said, while treating of the Scriptures: "But the books which we call Apocrypha are so named, because they have not received from the Holy Spirit the same authority as those which are correctly and undoubtedly canonical, of which number are the Pentateuch of Moses, and the Hagiographa, and the Prophets which the Synod of Laodicea directed to be read from the twenty-two books of the Old Testament." Then follows a correct summary of the New Testament books.

Metrophanes, after enumerating the Old Testament books which are contained in the Hebrew canon, and indicating all belonging to the New Testament, remarks: "But the other books which some wish to catalogue with the Holy Scripture, as Tobias, Judith, Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach, Baruch, and the books of Machabees, we indeed do not think are to be neglected. For they contain many moral principles, worthy of a great deal of praise. But the Church of Christ never received them as canonical, as many, especially St. Gregory the Theologian, and St. Amphilochius, and last of all St. John Damascene, testify. Wherefore we do not attempt to establish our doctrines out of those, but out of the thirty-three canonical books, which we call Inspired and Holy Scripture." He had just said that the canonical books amounted to thirty-three, but said so solely to fabricate a mystical relation between them and the thirty-three years of the mortal life spent by the Redeemer on earth—ridiculous trifling with a solemn subject! Why not say that the canonical books amount to only three, because He spent three days in the grave; or better still, to forty, because He fasted forty days or remained on earth forty days after His ascension? Metrophanes seems to have been a simple layman, when he committed his errors to paper, and never afterwards on his return to Greece, when

promoted to ecclesiastical honor, to have proposed them to the acceptance of any one. He therefore probably was allowed to die in peace, while his patron Cyril, because he had brought disgrace on the patriarchal dignity as a teacher of heresy, was persecuted in life and anathematized in death by the outraged members of his own flock.

Let us now see what was done by the Greeks, in reference to the teaching of Cyril Lucar, regarding the canon of the Old Testament, after the Synod of Constantinople, held in 1638, under his successor, Cyril Contari had, as we have seen, condemned Lucar's views within three months after the awful death of the latter. In 1642 Parthenius, who had succeeded Cyril Contari, convened a council in Constantinople. Its acts are sometimes confounded with those of the Synod held soon after at Jassy, in Moldavia, because the latter adopted as its own the decrees contained in a synodal letter addressed to it by the council under Parthenius. These decrees, as well as other papers connected with the Synod of Jassy, the whole being preceded by the decrees of the Council of Constantinople, are incorporated in the acts of the Council of Jerusalem, held on March 16, 1672, under Dositheus, the schismatical Patriarch of that city. In the XVIII. or last decree belonging to the synodal letter just mentioned, it is said that Cyril Lucar had embodied in his confession certain questions no better than the confession itself, "Inasmuch as he also, as above, not only rejects the interpretations given by our Fathers to the Scripture, but expunges some of its books, which holy and *ecumenical councils* have received as *canonical*."[1] The books referred to are, of course, those which Cyril had called apocryphal. The proceedings of the Council of Constantinople were subscribed by three Patriarchs, twenty-one bishops,

[1] Kimmel, *Monumenta Fidei*, Part i. p. 415–416.

and twenty-three others; those of the Council of Jassy by Parthenius, Patriarch of Constantinople, Peter Mogilas,[1] metropolitan of Kiew, eight Bishops, thirty-five synodal officials, some of whom were bishops, and other persons of great dignity.

The controversy which originated with Cyril Lucar constitutes by itself quite a literature; and although many documents connected with it have already been published, many still remain unedited and will probably ever remain so. One such seems to have been first cited by an English writer in Dixon's *Introduction to the Sacred Scripture.*[2] It is one of a collection preserved in Paris, containing the proceedings of the Greek Church in reference to the innovations attempted by Cyril, and formerly belonging to the library of St. Germain de Pres. It was signed July 18, 1671, at Pera, a suburb of Constantinople, by seven archbishops of the Greek Church, Bartholomew of Heraclea, Jerome of Chalcedon, Methodius of Pisidia, Metrophanes of Cyzicum, Anthony of Athens, Joachim of Rhodes, Neophite of Nicomedia. In it the condemnation of Cyril by the Council of Constantinople under Parthenius is approved, and in the fourteenth article it is declared, "that the books of Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, and the Machabees make part of the Holy Scripture, and are not to be rejected as profane."

Another Synod, bearing the date of January 1672,[3] was held in Constantinople under Dionysius, then patriarch of that city. Its purpose seems to have been to satisfy certain enquiries made in consequence of doubts excited by the teaching of Cyril's partisans, although throughout the instructions given to dissipate those doubts the name of Cyril is not once mentioned. About to conclude what they had to say to their flocks, the bishops remark, "with regard to the scriptural books,

[1] Or *Mogila.* [2] Vol. i. p. 30. [3] Kimmel *Monumenta*, Part ii. p. 214.

we find that they have been enumerated in various ways by the Apostolic canons, and the holy Synods in Laodicea and Carthage, the constitutions of Clement being excluded, since the second canon of the Sixth Synod removes them, because they had been corrupted by the heretics, as is known to every one who cares to inquire and learn what books are admitted. Such books, therefore, of the Old Testament as are not comprised in the enumeration of writers on theological subjects are not for that reason rejected as profane and unhallowed, but are treated as precious and excellent, and not at all to be despised." Then follow the subscriptions of Dionysius and several other bishops.[1]

We must now call attention to the testimony rendered by another council of Greek bishops already referred to, that of Jerusalem, held in 1672, under Dositheus, then patriarch of that city. Following the example set by the Council of Jassy, it anathematized, not Cyril Lucar, but all the errors contained in the confession published as his, and all who favored or professed those errors. For, in fact, in both councils the confession was treated as a Calvinistic forgery. And the Council of Jerusalem actually cited several passages from sermons and homilies of Cyril, to prove that, in the writings known to be his, his teaching was directly opposed to that found in the confession, the authorship of which, while it was never claimed, was, however, never disavowed by him. In this way the Council shows, for instance, that Cyril had treated Tobias, Wisdom, and the history of Susanna as Sacred Scripture, and intimated that it would be easy to multiply such evidence by extracts from the homilies of Cyril then at hand. But taking up the third question in the confession attributed to Cyril, "What books do you call Sacred Scripture?" the Council answers it by distinctly declaring, that "Following the rule of the

[1] Kimmel, *Monumenta*, Part ii., 225.

Catholic Church we call all those books Sarced Scripture, which Cyril, copying the Synod of Laodicea, enumerates, and in addition to them those which he foolishly and ignorantly, or rather maliciously, pronounced apocryphal, to wit the wisdom of Solomon, Judith, Tobias, the History of the Dragon, the History of Susanna, the Machabees, the Wisdom of Sirach. For we judge these genuine parts of the Scripture along with the other genuine books of the divine Scripture, because ancient custom and most of all the Catholic Church has handed it down that the sacred Gospels are genuine, and that the other books of the Scripture are genuine, and that these beyond all doubt are parts of the Holy Scripture; and the denial of these latter (books) is the rejection of the former. But if it seems that all have not been always catalogued by all, these, nevertheless, are numbered and catalogued with all the Scripture by synods, and by the most ancient and approved theologians of the Catholic Church. All which books we both judge to be canonical, and confess to be sacred Scripture." The decrees of this Council are signed by Dositheus, patriarch of Jerusalem, and by sixty-eight Eastern bishops and ecclesiastics, including some who represented the Russian Church.[1]

Further evidence is hardly necessary to prove what no one familiar with the agitation which the career of Cyril Lucar occasioned, will deny—that then and subsequently the Greek hierarchy was unanimous in maintaining the canonicity of the Old Testament deutero books; yet the reader will, it is hoped, hear patiently two other witnesses, whom Ubaldi, while discussing this subject, has introduced.[2] One is Macharius, the schismatical patriarch of Antioch, who, according to Renaudot,[3] in 1671

[1] Kimmel, *Monumenta Fidei*, Part i. pp. 487, 488.

[2] *Introd. in S. Script.*, i., 341.

[3] *La perpétuité del a foi*, Tom. iii., 531 (*Ed Paris*, 1704.)

denounced the errors of the Calvinists, and severely condemned the Protestants generally for having expunged from the canon the Apocalypse, the Epistle of James, and the books of Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Machabees. "But we," he says, "receive and read all these in the pure, holy, and orthodox Church." The other witness is Neophyte, schismatical patriarch of Antioch, who, on May 3, 1673, at the request of De Nointel French ambassador to the Sublime Porte, subscribed, in the name of all the bishops and priests belonging to his patriarchate, a profession of faith against the innovations of Protestants. In that profession of faith it is declared, that "we receive all the divine books which the Holy Fathers and councils have received. Of this number are Tobias, Judith, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, and Machabees; and we believe the words of these books to be the word of God." [1]

Since then the belief of the Greek schismatics regarding the canon of Scripture has remained unchanged. Thus the impious project which Cyril was the first among his countrymen to conceive, while it precipitated his own ruin, led to results which his Protestant abettors had good reason to deplore. For the unanimous protest which that project evoked throughout the East, proved to the world that the principles of the Protestant creed were as thoroughly detested among the Greeks as among the Latins, and that the Tridentine canon with its deutero books was not more a matter of faith in Rome than in Constantinople, Jerusalem, Antioch, and wherever else communities were found professing the creed which Cyril Lucar attempted to corrupt.

[1] *La Perpet. de la foi*, Tom. iii. p. 547.

CHAPTER XVI.

Conversion of the Slavonians.—Origin of the Schismatical Russo-Greek Church.

It is somewhat doubtful whether the first to preach the Gospel among the Russians were missionaries from Rome or Constantinople. Heard,[1] a recent Protestant writer, who as consul-general of the United States for Russia had ample opportunity for ascertaining the traditional belief of the Russian people on the subject, states that it is generally held by them that "St. Anthony the Great, or the *Roman*," during the persecution excited by the Iconoclasts, who began to disturb the peace of the Church in the early part of the eighth century, was borne on a rock from "the Tiber" to Novogorod, a Russian city of great antiquity. There he was received by St. Nitika, the metropolitan of a church already established in the place, and joined with him in prayers, each being miraculously enabled to understand the language of the other. The ruler of the city gave Anthony land on which to build the celebrated monastery named after its holy founder. And "the boat of stone still excites the devotion of the worshippers, and the palm branches in the chapel are still as green as when brought from Rome by Anthony." This would imply that the germ of Christianity was planted in Russia by the combined labors of Latins and Greeks.

If, however, an attempt was then made to introduce Christian principles to that part of Europe, it must have

[1] *The Russian Church and Russian Dissent*, p. 13, New York, 1887.

failed. For the various nations there settled were still generally unconverted until as late as the middle of the ninth century, when SS. Cyril and Methodius undertook to plant the cross among them. These two brothers were natives of Thessalonica. Both became priests, the latter embracing the monastic state in Constantinople, where the other seems to have resided and to have been favorably known. For when the Chazari, a tribe settled on the banks of the Danube, near the confines of Germany, sent an embassy to Constantinople, for the purpose of obtaining missionaries to labor among them, Ignatius, the holy patriarch, was requested by the Emperor Michael III. and his mother, the pious Empress Theodora, to select some ecclesiastic possessed of the necessary qualifications for a position so important. The choice of the patriarch, who was always in communion with Rome, and often appealed to that See when his own rights were afterwards invaded by the usurper Photius, fell in 848 on Cyril. A church having been organized among the Chazari by the apostolic labors of this devoted priest, he returned to Constantinople and prevailed on his brother Methodius to take part in the mission, to which he had consecrated his own life. Their united efforts were soon rewarded by the conversion of other northern tribes. Bogoris, King of the Bulgarians, with all his people, after being instructed by Methodius, embraced the Christian religion. After taking the name of Michael in baptism, he sent an embassy to Pope Nicholas I. with presents and letters, requesting to be further instructed on the new life on which he had entered. In answer to his pious request the Pope wrote,[1] in 867, congratulating him on his conversion, and sent him at the same time two Italian bishops, Paul of Populania and Formosus of Porto, to confirm those who had been already baptized, and complete the work

[1] See the Pope's letter in Henrion's *Hist. De L'Eglise*, Tom. iv., p. 29, etc.

done by Methodius. The two prelates also brought along with them the divine Scriptures, and such other books as were required by the wants of the new mission. Cyril and Methodius afterwards came to Rome to render an account of their ministry. They were there honored by a triumphal reception. Adrian II., who had succeeded Nicholas, having approved of all they had done, promoted both to the episcopate. Cyril having died while in Rome, Methodius returned to the scene of his former labors. By the zeal of these two devoted missionaries, assisted, of course, by others from Rome and Constantinople, Christianity was established among the tribes already mentioned, the Moravians and others, whose vernacular was the Slavonic language, or some of its dialects. Methodius is also said, after his return from Rome, to have visited Muscovy, and to have established a see in Kiew.[1] The two brothers also invented the Slavonic alphabet, translated the Scriptures and Liturgy into Slavonic, and introduced the celebration of Mass in that language. It also appears, that the Slavonic Old Testament, then prepared for all who used that language, was a translation of the *Vetus Itala*,[2] which is known to have contained the deutero books. Others,[3] however, are of opinion that the brothers followed the Septuagint, when they provided their converts with a Slavonic Old Testament. But in that case, too, the Slavonic Bible, now no longer extant, must have comprised the deutero books, for the Septuagint had them.

But among the Russians, a branch of the great Slavonic family, many members of which had been converted by Cyril and Methodius, Christianity appears to have made little progress before the end of the tenth century. At last Vladimir, their ruler, having been baptized, was

[1] Alban Butler's *Lives of Saints*, Dec. 22, and *Roman Breviary*, July 5.

[2] Kitto's *Cyclop.*, *Versions*. [3] Danko, *De S. Script.*, i., 239.

determined that his subjects should also receive this sacred rite, and with the assistance of ecclesiastics from Constantinople he succeeded in his pious purpose. The conversion of Russia having therefore been accomplished between the extinction of the schism produced by Photius, finally deposed in 886, and its renewal by Michael Cerularius, in 1053, an interval during which the supremacy of the Pope was recognized by the Greeks, it follows that the Russian Church at its creation was in communion with Rome, and remained so all through and long after the schismatical proceedings of Cerularius at Constantinople. For Isiaslif, grandson of Vladimir, sent his own son to Rome "to do homage to the Pontiff for his kingdom, and to put his states under the protection of thePrince of the Apostles." The reply of St. Gregory VII. is dated April 17, 1075,[1] that is, twenty-two years after Cerularius had renewed the schism, and sixteen after he had closed his miserable career, disgraced and degraded. Even Voltaire notices in his Annals, that Demetrius, driven from the throne of Russia in 1275, "appealed to the Pope as the judge of all Christians."[2] Heard, quoted above, acknowledges, that, "when Christianity was introduced in Russia, the schism dividing the East and the West, although threatening, was not declared, and the Russian establishment was a branch of the Church Universal still in theory, one and indivisible." But he adds: "The final separation, consummated in 1054, aroused but little, if any, attention in Russia."[3] Partly true, partly false. It is indeed true that the schismatical course pursued by Cerularius was greeted with little, rather no sympathy in Russia, which, by the facts just referred to, and many others that might be cited,[4] is proved to have remained loyal to Rome

[1] Rohrbacher *Hist. de L'Egl.*, Tom. xiv. p. 194.

[2] *Dublin Review*, Vol. xxiii., p. 424, note.

[3] *The Russian Church and Russian dissent*, p. 24.

[4] Rohrbacher, *Hist. de L'Egl.*, Tom... p. 130.

from the time of its conversion until long after the death of that ambitious prelate. But it is not true, that the final separation between the East and the West was consummated in 1054, or at any time before 1439, when Latins, Greeks, and Russians met together in the Council of Florence, under the presidency of Eugenius IV., then Sovereign Pontiff; and all, with the single exception of Mark of Ephesus, acknowledged the primacy of the Pope. As a matter of fact, that dogma, to the profession of which all solemnly pledged themselves by their signatures, was not repudiated finally by the East before the year 1444. The canon of Scriptures was not discussed at Florence, the question being one about which there was no controversy. But before the close of the Council circumstances arose which called for a decree[1] on the subject, and the same books subsequently sanctioned as part of the Sacred Scripture by the Council of Trent were then declared canonical.

Within two years after the close of the Council of Florence, the perfidious Greeks had violated the compact to which they had then solemnly pledged themselves. That was the last drop, which caused the cup of their iniquity to overflow; for, seven years more had hardly passed, when the proud prelates of those obtinate schismatics, who had renounced all allegiance to the Vicar of Christ, were ground to the dust under the crushing tyranny of the despot who represented the false prophet. What a sad picture is that which the reader contemplates as he examines the history of those men, who, ever since the Sultan superseded the Pope among the downtrodden Greeks, pretended to fill the chair of Chrysostom. "Their procession (says Mr. Heard) is a

[1] It was passed in 1441, after the Council had been transferred to Rome, and the greater part of the Greeks had returned home. But it belongs to the acts of the Council, which was still in session when it was adopted as part of the instructions for the Jacobites. Besides, at the time there was no conflict of opinion between the East and the West regarding the canon of Scripture.

melancholy one: Joasaph Cocas, persecuted by his clergy, attempted, in despair, to drown himself in a well; rescued and reseated on the throne, he was driven into exile by the Sultan; Mark Xylocarabœus was exiled; Simeon paid a thousand gold florins for his seat, and was thrown into a monastery; Dionysius had the same fate; Raphael, to secure his nomination, doubled the tribute hitherto exacted; unable to pay the sum promised, he was thrust forth, loaded with chains, to beg by the roadside, and died in misery; Nyphon had his nose cut off, and was forced into exile; Joachim raised the tribute to three thousand ducats, was exiled, recalled, and again exiled; Pacome was poisoned; Jeremiah I. started on a pastoral tour, his vicar deserted him on the way, hurried back, bribed the vizier, and usurped the See; he was driven away by a popular outbreak, and Jeremiah's friends purchased for him permission to resume his seat; Joasaph II. again raised the tribute, was deposed and excommunicated by his clergy for simony; Gregory was cast into the sea; Cyril Lucar was exiled and strangled; Metrophanes, accused of simony, was induced to resign by the offer of two dioceses; he sold the one and administered the other; Jeremiah II., bishop of Larissa, was elected and confirmed in 1572; his funds were exhausted by the tribute, then fixed at ten thousand florins, and he piteously complained in his correspondence that he dared not undertake a pastoral tour to replenish his treasury from the alms of the faithful, for fear that in his absence some ambitious brother might seize upon the throne. The danger was real. Metrophanes reappeared and reasserted his claims to the patriarchate; as his purse was the longer, he was reinstated on appeal to the Sultan. At his death Jeremiah again enjoyed a brief spell of power, but, accused of conspiracy against the government, he was imprisoned, then

exiled to Rhodes. Theoptus, his accuser, seized the vacant seat, disputed also by Pacome, a monk of Lesbos, and, by the opportune payment of a double tribute, secured the imperial comfirmation; imprudently he ventured on a pastoral visit to Wallachia, and in his absence Jeremiah's friends purchased *his* pardon and reseated him on the throne."[1] We have met with Jeremiah already, and will soon meet with him again.

In Russia, the act of union, which had been so solemnly ratified by all parties at Florence, was hardly commenced, when it was scornfully rejected by the civil ruler under the following circumstances. The Church there, in 1415, consisted of the two metropolitan sees, Kiew and Moscow, and the suffragan episcopal dioceses attached to each. Soon after, the two sees were united, being governed by the Metropolitan Isidore sent from Constantinople by the patriarch Joseph. By the permission of prince Wassali III., Isidore, with other Russian prelates, was present at the Council of Florence. And the act of union having been there adopted in 1439, he returned to Russia the same year as delegate apostolic, sending before him a pastoral announcing that the union had been consummated. In Kiew and its dependencies, he met with a joyful and cordial reception. But on reaching Moscow in the following spring, he was greeted with different feelings. Determined, however, to perform what he considered his duty, he entered processionally the Church of Our Lady in the Kremlin, and after Mass had a deacon read the decree of union from the pulpit. It was listened to by the people in silence. An autograph letter from the Pope was coldly received from the hands of Isidore by the prince, who, after indignantly repudiating the union, had Isidore arrested and thrown into prison, whence he escaped after two years' confinement

[1] *The Russian Church and Russian Dissent*, p. 59.

and found a safe refuge in Rome, where he died 1463.

Sad as is the picture which we have contemplated of the miserable condition to which the schismatical patriarchs of Constantinople were reduced under the pitiless rule of the Sultan, it is hardly more so than that which the historian sketches when describing the treatment which the Russian bishops received from the Czar, after the Russian Church had been declared independent of Rome. Zosimos, metropolitan, was deposed and relegated to a monastery by Ivan III.; Barlaam, also metropolitan, was compelled to retire by Vassili IV. Daniel, who succeeded, sanctioned Vassili's divorce from his wife, and his marriage with another woman, contrary to the Greek canons. Daniel and his successor were afterwards compelled, the one to abdicate, and the other to go into exile. Leonidas, archbishop of Novogorod, was sowed up in a bear-skin and worried by dogs, according to the despotic order of Ivan IV., worthily nicknamed "the Terrible;" the Archbishop's offence was his refusal to unite the inhuman monster to a fourth wife. He had three more after her, and during his reign, besides murdering his own son, butchered about five hundred priests and religious, and massacred some sixty thousand people. As supreme head of a schismatical church he was the right man in the right place. Anastasius, another metropolitan, terrified at the atrocities of Ivan, probably saved his life by retiring to a monastery. Germanus, appointed, declined the perilous post; Philip consented to fill the vacancy, was soon seized at the altar, disrobed, dragged to prison, and transferred to the monastery of Ostroch, where he was strangled in his cell by order of the Czar. Job, the first patriarch, was dragged from the altar by an infuriated mob; degraded, insulted, and beaten, he was hurried away to confinement in the monastery of Staritza. Archbishop Tver was slain; Gennadius, bishop of Pskof,

died of a broken heart; Gelaktion, bishop of Sowzdal, perished in exile; Joseph, bishop of Kolomna, was dragged in chains from town to town. Nikon, the patriarch, and one of the best prelates the Russian schism has ever produced, for his efforts to remedy abuses in Church and state, was maltreated by a mob, and left for dead on the streets. Subsequently he was placed on trial before a court, in which the Czar presided, and which was composed of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, eight metropolitans of the Greek Church outside Russia, with all the great dignitaries of the Russian hierarchy. Nikon, after being condemned, was degraded and sentenced to do penance the rest of his life in a far-distant monastery. Some time after, he was permitted to spend his last days in the monastery of Voskresensk, but breathed his last at Yaroslav, as he lay stretched in the barge which bore him on the Volga to his destination. The picture is sufficiently sickening, without intensifying its horrors by prolonging the dark catalogue, or adding to it the Catholic martyrs of every rank and age in Poland and Russia, whose sufferings bear witness to the savage deeds which disgraced the history of the Czars after they usurped the spiritual powers which belonged, not only by divine right, but by long-established precedent, to the Roman Pontiff.

But to return to Jeremiah II., patriarch of Constantinople. Ivan "the Terrible," at his death in 1586, left his crown to his feeble son Feodor I., who, under the influence of his wife, allowed her brother Boris Godounov to control the affairs of Church and State. This unscrupulous favorite determined that, as the Russian Church had swung loose from Rome, it should be independent of Constantinople. That once opulent see, through the exactions of the Sultan and the ambition of competitors for the patriarchal dignity, was so impoverished that Jeremiah, no longer able to provide for the expenses of

divine worship without appealing to his friends at a distance, was compelled to solicit in person alms among the people of Russia, at the risk of finding on his return his throne occupied by some one with a larger bribe than he could offer. He reached Russia soon after the accession of Feodor I., and the astute Godounov formed his plan for making the necessities of the illustrious mendicant subservient to the success of the measures necessary for remodelling the Russian hierarchy. Jeremiah was asked to establish his residence in Russia. To this he assented, provided the patriarchal see should be attached to Moscow. But given to understand that that honor was reserved for Vladimir, and suspecting, no doubt with reason, that he was or would be the dupe of the wily Godounov, Jeremiah concluded that, after all, Russian hospitality might be less tolerable than Turkish brutality, and decided on declining the proffered patriarchate. When, however, it was proposed that he should create a new and independent Russian patriarch, he agreed; and as it had been arranged between Godounov and himself, the choice fell upon Job, then primate and a creature of the former. Apprehensive of the trouble in store for him at Constantinople for his part in the transaction, Jeremiah was anxious to leave, but much against his will was persuaded to take part in and officiate at the installation of the new patriarch, thus simoniacally surrendering all the rights of his patriarchate over the Russian Church. Loaded with alms and presents, he was at last allowed to depart in the spring of 1589. The two prelates who accompanied him disavowed his acts, and the other Greek patriarchs were slow to approve them, and when they did so it was only on condition that the Russian patriarchate should be fifth in the order of precedence, instead of third as arranged by Jeremiah, and that its incumbent should seek investiture at Constantinople. It is needless to observe that neither

condition was insisted on. In 1721, Peter the Great, after murdering his own son and butchering the metropolitans of Kiew and Rostow, with scores of the clergy, abolished the patriarchate, substituting for it what is called the *Holy Governing Synod*, through which the Czar exercises supreme control over the Russian Church.

One might suppose, that under the circumstances the entire Russian population professes the same faith and belongs to the same Church. But it is far otherwise. For it may be said, without exaggeration, that among the subjects of the Czar there are millions who are in no way connected with the Church of which he is the supreme head, and are themselves divided into countless sects, whose countless creeds are opposed, many of them, to the fundamental principles of the Christian religion, while others outrage the plainest dictates of common sense, or treat with contempt the obvious rules of common decency. To this babel of religion and ethics must be added various communities still deep in the mire of paganism, and likely to remain long so. For nothing can be done towards their conversion without the permission of the government, which appears to think that they are as easily ruled as many Christians inside or outside the national Church. And as absolute submission to its despotic will is the only matter about which that government is concerned, it requires no array of statistics to figure out the result.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE RUSSO-GREEK CHURCH ON THE CANON. PETITION OF ANGLICAN NON JURORS FOR RECOGNITION BY GREEKS AND RUSSIANS. RECENT CONFERENCES BETWEEN ANGLICANS, OLD CATHOLICS, GREEKS, AND RUSSIANS FOR INTERCOMMUNION. THESE CONFERENCES ON THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

From several facts referred to in the preceding brief sketch of the Russian Church it is evident, that the Bible it received at its origin embraced the deutero books. For this is a necessary consequence of its union with Constantinople and Rome, where these books, at the time, constituted an integral part of the divine volume. Indeed, the first Bibles placed in the hands of Russian Christians were, as we have seen, translated from the Septuagint or the Ancient Vulgate, perhaps from both; either of which, it is unnecessary to say, contained all the books now found in that copy of the Sacred Scriptures authenticated by the Council of Trent. Any doubt, however, on this subject must give way to the following considerations.

Peter Mogila, metropolitan of Moscow, was present at the Council of Jassy in 1642, where he, with Parthenius, patriarch of Constantinople, eight bishops, thirty-five synodal officials, including many bishops, and other dignitaries,[1] condemned Cyril Lucar for having, among other errors, "expunged some books of the Sacred Scriptures, which had been received as canonical by

[1] Kimmel, *Monumenta*, Part I. p. 417.

holy and ecumenical synods." [1] The books referred to were, of course, the deutero Scriptures of the Old Testament. Cyril, in excluding these books from the divine collection, had said, "these twenty-two books, which the Council of Laodicea directed to be read, were alone undoubtedly canonical;" [2] but, with the fatuity or inconsistency characteristic of malicious error, he overlooked or ignored the fact that Baruch was among the books directed to be read by the Fathers at Laodicea.

The aforesaid Mogila had already, in 1640, written, as it was first called, "An Exposition of the Faith of the Russian Church," in which, though there is no reference to the canon of Scripture, *Tobias* is cited in *Part* II., *Question* xlvii., and as "Sacred Scripture" in *Part* III., *Question* ix. *Wisdom* is appealed to as "Sacred Scripture" in *Part* I. *Question* lxvii, *Ecclesiasticus* is introduced as Scripture" in *Part* I. *Question* x, and again as "Scripture" in *Part* I. *Question* xvi. It is quoted a second time in the same *Question*. It is met with again as "Scripture" in *Part* I. *Question* xxiii. Before that question is fully answered it meets us again. And it is also cited as "Scripture" in *Part* III. *Question* xxiv. The work in which these citations are found is simply a large catechism with short questions and long answers, and has since been entitled by Greeks and Russians, "An Orthodox Confession of the Faith of the Catholic Apostolic Church of the East." It was revised and adopted by a provincial synod in Kiew for Russia in 1640, again examined and corrected by a council of Greeks and Russians at Jassy, in 1643, when it was reduced to it present form by Miletius Syriga, metropolitan of Nicæa, and exarch of the patriarch of Constantinople. It is preceded by a preface from the pen of Nectarius, patriarch of Jerusa-

[1] Kimmel, *Monumenta*, Part I. 416.

[2] Supra., 211.

[3] Kimmel, *Monumenta*. Part I. p. p. § 6-324.

[4] Ibid, p. 45.

lem, dated at Constantinople, Nov. 20, 1662, and containing a history of its composition.[1] This preface is followed by a statement of Parthenius, patriarch of Constantinople, dated March 11, 1643, and approving the contents of the catechism as found in the Greek text.[1] The statement is signed by Parthenius, the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and twenty-two other Greek prelates. Mogila's catechism was approved again by the Council of Jerusalem in 1672,[2] and is therefore regarded as an authoritative exposition of the creed taught by the schismatical Greek and Russian Churches. It has served as a model for several catechisms written since by Russian divines, and it does not appear that in any of them the deutero books were treated with less respect than they received in it, though in the latest of such works, and that even by the highest dignitary in the Russian Church, these books might seem to be treated with less consideration than the others belonging to the Old Testament.

But before referring more directly to the most recent of Russian catechisms, there is another Russian book we must mention, one which, not only on account of its age, but because it was intended for aspirants to the clerical state, is first entitled to the reader's attention. An English translation of it is contained in a work on "The Doctrine of the Russian Church, by the Rev. R. W. Blackmore, B. A., formerly of Merton College, Oxford, Chaplain to the Russian Company at Cronstadt. Aberdeen, 1845." The book which Mr. Blackmore has translated is a treatise "On the Duty of Parish Priests," by George Konissky (d. 1795), archbishop of Mogileff and White Russia, and a member of the Russian Synod. The treatise, we are told by the translator, has been adopted by the whole Russian Church. It gives no cat-

[1] Kimmel, *Monumenta*, Part I., p. 52. [2] Ibid., p. 336.

alogue of the sacred books, but informs the reader[1] that he will find them enumerated in various works, among others "the Council of Carthage," which is well known to have included all the books approved by the Council of Trent. But the treatise is well provided with citations from the Scripture, and among those citations are several from the deutero books, some of them, too, adduced for the purpose of establishing doctrine. *Sirach* (Ecclesiasticus) i., 23; ii., 11, is cited in chapter xxxiii., p. 220. Then we have in chapter xlix., p. 235, "*And now, O Lord, I take not this my sister to be my wife for lust, but uprightly*" (Tob. viii., 7), words which the priest is recommended to impress on the minds of those who are about to be married. In chapter liii., p. 269, where the Scriptures are frequently quoted, the words, "*The sacrifice to God is a contrite spirit: a contrite and humble heart God will not despise,*" are attributed to Ps. li., 17, and *Ecclesiasticus* xxv., 17. In chapter xvi., part ii., p. 281, it is said that the priest ought "to pray also for the departed, in the hope and faith of the resurrection of them that sleep; of this we have a certain assurance both from the *Scripture* and also from Christ's holy Church in apostolical and primitive times." Then the author proceeds to the proof by citing *Baruch:* "*O Lord,*" he says, "*Almighty, Thou God of Israel, hear now the prayer of the dead Israelites . . . . and remember not the iniquities of our forefathers* (ch. iii., 4, 5). In the second book of *Machabees* it is written: *All therefore, praising the righteous judgment of the Lord, betook themselves unto prayer, praying that the sins committed might be blotted out . . . . whereupon He made a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be loosed from their sin*" (ch. xii., 41—46). After this several Fathers are appealed to in support of the same holy doctrine. Has it ever been known that a writer who rejected the Tridentine canon made use of

[1] p. 163.

such citations as these? No Protestant could do so without repudiating his own canon. Whatever may be the errors of the Russian schismatical Church, the rejection of the deutero books is not one of them. Outside the circle of conglomerate Protestantism that error finds not a single defender at this moment.

A few lines above it was said that in the latest Russian catechism the deutero books might seem to be treated with less consideration than the other Old Testament books. That remark applied to the catechism written by Philaret, metropolitan of Moscow (d. 1867). A translation of that catechism is contained in Blackmore's book mentioned above; we are thus able to ascertain the treatment which the deutero Scriptures received from one of the latest and highest ecclesiastical writers in the Russian Church. Philaret was for a long time a member of "the Holy Governing Synod" at St. Petersburg, even when metropolitan of Moscow; but the Czar Nicholas, displeased with his votes at the meetings of that body, at last intimated to him that he would be better employed in his own diocese. Philaret took the hint and withdrew to Moscow, no doubt glad that he was not suspended or even degraded by the pope of all the Russias. His catechism is entitled "The Longer Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic Church of the East, examined and approved by the most Holy Governing Synod, and published for the use of schools, and of all orthodox Christians, by order of his Imperial Majesty. Moscow, at the Synodal Press, 1839." In four points the catechism is opposed to the teaching of the Catholic Church. Defining the Church, it ignores the supremacy of the Pope. Referring to the Holy Ghost, it states that He proceeds from the Father alone. Treating of Baptism, it insists on a trine immersion as essential, thus differing from the Greeks, and, *perhaps*, excludes the deutero books from the canon. We say *perhaps*, for it

is not quite certain, as the following references show, that it really does so: "*Q.* How many are the books of the Old Testament? *A.* St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Athanasius the Great, and St. John Damascene reckon them at *twenty-two*, agreeing therein with the Jews, who so reckon them in the original Hebrew tongue. Athanas. Ep. xxxix.,[1] De Test., J. Damasc., Theol., l. iv., c. 17 . . . ." "*Q.* How do St. Cyril and St. Athanasius enumerate the books of the Old Testament?"[2] The answer to this question is an enumeration of the 22 books as they are found in the Protestant Bible, the First and Second Samuel of the latter being called First and Second Kings by Philaret, who has Paralipomenon instead of Chronicles. Again, "*Q.* Why is there no notice taken, in this enumeration of the books of the Old Testament, of the book of the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, and of certain others? *A.* Because they do not exist in the Hebrew. *Q.* How are we to regard these last-named books? *A.* Athanasius the Great says that they have been appointed of the Fathers to be read by proselytes for admission into the Church."[3] This is all that is said on the subject. In the enumeration of the books by Philaret, Esther and I. Esdras, as well as II. Esdras or Nehemias are mentioned, but Baruch is omitted. In doing so Philaret has contradicted his own witnesses. For Esther is called non-canonical in the Athanasian Festal Epistle and Synopsis, while Esdras and Nehemias are omitted in the Athanasian Festal Epistle and Synopsis, and Baruch is included among the twenty-two by the Athanasian Festal Epistle and by Cyril, though overlooked by Philaret. Whether these mistakes of Philaret are to be attributed to ignorance or malice we cannot say.

At any rate, it may reasonably be doubted, whether Philaret meant to exclude the deutero books from the

[1] Otherwise called the *Festal Epistle.*

[2] P. 38.

[3] P 38, 39.

roll of Sacred Scriptures. For he has appealed in his catechism more than once to the authority of Machabees. Thus speaking of prayers for the dead,[1] he says that the doctrine is grounded "on the constant tradition of the Catholic Church, the sources of which may be seen in the Church of the Old Testament. Judas Machabæus offered sacrifice for his men that had fallen (II. Mach. xii. 43)." Machabees must therefore belong to the Church of the Old Testament. Again, speaking of the special duties which children owe to their parents, he says,[2] "that children are bound after the death of their parents, as well as during their lives, to pray for the salvation of their souls," and cites as authority for this II. Mach. xii. 43–44, Jerem. xxxv. 18, 19, as if these two books were of equal authority. Indeed, in all these Russian catechisms, as well as in the collections of conciliar decrees condemning the errors of Cyril Lucar—decrees enacted by Russians as well as Greeks—the deutero books, when they contain any text applicable to the matter in hand, are cited indiscriminately with the other parts of the Bible. This was the general, indeed, the universal rule at the time; and the writings of Philaret seem to offer no exception, for, not only in his Catechism, but in his other compositions which we have seen, he cites, where it suits him, the deutero just as he does the proto books of the Old Testament. Thus, in a volume of select sermons by him, published in London in 1883, he cites Wisdom in Sermons viii. xiv., xv., xxi., twice as the production of Solomon; and cites Ecclesiasticus in Sermons xxiii., xxvii., these being the only two of the deutero books containing texts adapted to the ascetic and devotional character of the sermons.

So far, therefore, as a conclusion can be drawn from the use made of the deutero books by the Russian theologians, it cannot reasonably be denied, that the canonicity

[1] P. 99. [2] P. 131.

of these books is admitted by them. In fact, this inference is warranted by the statement of Humphrey Hody, the Oxford professor, who in 1705 remarked,[1] that the Muscovite Bible, which is a translation of the Septuagint, contains all the deutero books mixed among the proto, and the apocryphal books III. and IV. Esdras and III. Machabees. This mixture of proto and deutero books in the Russian Bible, no doubt, existed from the time when the Scriptures were first translated into the Russian language. It could not be otherwise, since that Bible is a version of the Septuagint, in which the deutero books were always contained, at least away back to the time when the apostles delivered it to their converts, and indeed long before there was a Christian to receive it. And as used by the Greeks, the Septuagint includes these books still. For Reuss, Protestant professor in the University of Strasburg, after adverting to the abortive attempt of Cyril Lucar to induce the Greeks to adopt a mutilated canon by citing the doubtful authority of the Council of Laodicea, and to the condemnation of Cyril by the Greek Council of Jerusalem, remarks,[2] "So far as I am acquainted with the modern theological literature of the Greeks, no voice has been raised to make appeal from the Fathers of Jerusalem to those of Laodicea. I have before me a splendid quarto edition of the Greek Bible printed at Moscow, in 1821, by the order and under the auspices of the Holy Synod of the Russian Empire. It contains all the text of the Septuagint, and even more; for we find in it two recensions of Ezra, and four books of the Machabees." In a note he observes, that the edition contains Baruch, the Epistle of Jeremias, deutero Esther, and deutero Daniel. Of course it does, and all the other deutero books intermingled with the proto Scriptures. Doubtless this edition served as a sort of standard for the current Russian Bible published by the

[1] *De Bibl. Text.*, p. 650. [2] *Hist. of the Canon of the H. Script.*, p. 287.

Synod at St. Petersburg—the body through which the Czar governs the whole Russian Church. Better still, Cornely states,[2] that Russian Bibles of the edition approved by the "Synod of St. Petersburg," in 1876, contain not only the deutero books in their proper places, but even the Prayer of Manasses attached to II. Paralipomenon, III. Esdras after I. and II. Esdras, and IV. Esdras after the two books of Machabees; and adds, this is the case in the edition of 1876, approved by the Synod of St. Petersburg. But best of all, the present writer has at this moment before him a Russian Bible published in 1882 at St. Petersburg, with "the benediction of the Holy Orthodox Synod." As far as II. Paralipomenon inclusive the order of the books is the same therein as in the Latin Vulgate. To II. Paralipomenon is attached the Prayer of Manasses. Then follow I., II., and III. Esdras, Tobias, Judith, Esther with its deutero parts, Job, etc.; Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus follow the books of Solomon. After the prophecy of Jeremias, we have his Lamentations, then his Epistle, which in the Latin Vulgate is the sixth chapter of Baruch, then the five chapters of Baruch, then Daniel with its deutero parts. Last of all and after the Minor Prophets, we have I. and II. Machabees, which is followed by III. Machabees, and that by IV. Esdras, which closes the series of Old Testament books. It is generally known that among Catholics may be found copies of the Vulgate containing the Prayer of Manasses, and III. and IV. Esdras, and probably copies of the Septuagint containing, besides these apocrypha, III. Machabees. But it is also known, at least by Catholics, that these books are there without being considered by the Church as a part of the canon. Russian Christians, at least the educated among them, cannot have forgotten what was done by the representatives of their Church at Jerusalem and Jassy.

[2] *Introd. in S. Scrip.* vol. i., p. 121.

Russian Christians may therefore very reasonably be supposed to cling to the old belief, that the deutero books are canonical, and to retain in their Bibles certain apocryphal writings, because, like Catholics, they consider these writings of some value, and therefore to be retained in the sacred volume as the best means of consulting for their preservation, without, however, assigning them a place on the canon. Cornely [1] is of opinion that Philaret favored the error of Cyril Lucar regarding the canon. But Cyril discarded the deutero books altogether, declining to make any use of them in his confession; whereas Philaret, as we have seen, has often employed them in his writings, and in the same way and for the same purpose as he has availed himself of the proto Scriptures.

The authors of "A Catholic Dictionary," in an article on "the Russian Church," observe, that within the present century the works of English and German Protestants have been much read and used by Russian scholars, and that Philaret was the founder of a school devoted to the study of such works. How far this may be so we have no means of judging further than that Philaret was little known in Germany, though much admired in England, where some of his writings were translated and published. He was often called upon by English travellers anxious to bring about a union between Anglicanism and Russianism, and he may have listened to their propositions with courtesy. But so far from meeting them half way, as the silly enthusiasts expected, it does not appear that he was at any time disposed to make them the slightest concession. Indeed, he dared not do so. To modify the creed of the Russian Church belongs to the Czar, and the Czar alone. But though Philaret in his views and conduct may have failed to have attained the high standard established at

[1] *Introd. in S. Script.*, Vol. i., p. 121.

Jassy and Jerusalem, where Calvinism and Lutheranism received, as they deserved, no quarter, Russian orthodoxy will probably before long reassert its former uncompromising character, as a taste for the study of the ancient Fathers and their own early writers appears to be now cultivated by many among the younger members of the Russian clergy.

These remarks on the past and present of the Russian Church would be incomplete without something more than a passing allusion to the efforts made by members of the Anglican communion, in order to obtain recognition from the Eastern schismatics, especially those belonging to the Russian Church. We therefore now propose devoting a few paragraphs to that subject, while some of those who took part in the last attempt of the kind are still living.

After James II. was superseded on the throne of England by William and Mary, those of the beneficed clergy who refused to violate their oath of allegiance to the former by swearing fealty to the latter incurred the penalties of suspension and deprivation, and were called "Non-Jurors." The spirit by which they were actuated long survived them, and in 1717 those who inherited it, and were unwilling to transfer their allegiance from the representative of the Stuarts to the house of Hanover, under a sense of loneliness turned to the East for sympathy and companionship, hoping to obtain from that quarter some assurance of recognition denied them at home. The persecuted petitioners were four Protestant bishops, two belonging to England, and two to Scotland, namely (for in their appeal such are their respective signatures)—" Jeremias, Primus Angliæ Episcopus; Archibaldus, Scoto-Britanniae Episcopus; Jacobus, Scoto-Britanniae Episcopus; Thomas, Angliae Episcopus—The Catholic Remnant in Britain," as they, mourning over the afflictions of Sion, pathetically called them-

selves. To matter of fact Britishers the project must have seemed quixotic, and so it may at first have been considered by those who engaged in it. But they were encouraged to make the experiment by an Egyptian schismatical bishop, then in England begging relief for the miserable patriarchate of Alexandria. Not, however, until 1723 did they receive an answer from the Greek patriarchs, and then they were told by these dignitaries that, "Those who are disposed to agree with us on the Divine doctrines of the othordox faith must necessarily follow and submit to what has been defined and determined by ancient Fathers and the holy ecumenical synods, from the time of the Apostles and their holy successors, the Fathers of our Church, to this time. We say, they must submit to them with sincerity and obedience, and without any scruple or dispute. And this is a sufficient answer to what you have written." For the forlorn "Catholic Remnant in Britain," this was a peremptory summons to lay down their arms and surrender at discretion. Along with their Ultimatum the patriarchs sent a copy of the decrees passed by the Council of Jerusalem in 1672, thus notifying the British "Remnant" that they would have to renounce, along with their other errors, the mutilated canon of Scripture which had been foisted on them and their countrymen: for all the books which the reformers had rejected had been pronounced canonical at the Council of Jerusalem.[1]

"The Remnant" were treated with more consideration by the Russians. For "the Most Holy Governing Synod" of St. Petersburg, in transmitting the Ultimatum of the Eastern patriarchs, proposed, in the name of the Czar, then Peter the Great, "to the Most Reverend Bishops of the Remnant of the Catholic Church in Great Britain, our brethren most beloved of the Lord," that they should send two delegates to Russia, to hold a

[1] Vide supra, c. xiv., and Kimmel's *Monumenta*, Part I. p. 467.

friendly conference in the name and spirit of Christ, with two others to be appointed by the Russian Church, that thus it may be more easily ascertained what may be conceded by one to the other, and what may be for conscience' sake absolutely denied." The conference, however, was never held, as the death of Peter the Great, in 1725, put a stop to further negotiations. It may be, however, that the Russian authorities ceased to give the matter any attention, in consequence of a letter from Wake, Anglican archbishop of Canterbury, to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, in which the writer, besides other offensive names applied to the "Remnant," denounced them as schismatics, as if he were not such himself or something worse. However, among the Eastern patriarchs all Anglicans, including Wake, and the "Remnant," were accused of being Lutheran-Calvinists, while among the Russians they were represented as infected with the same "German heresy" which had already been condemned by the orthodox Church. So ended the first effort on the part of English Episcopalianism to fraternize with the Greek schism. Its failure was probably attributed in England to the character and standing of the men who inaugurated the movement. From the English establishment or the English crown they had no authority to open negotiations with Greeks or Russians; consequently nothing but disappointment was to be expected. Should, however, that venerable establishment condescend at any time to extend the right hand of fellowship to her sisters at Constantinople and St. Petersburg, the courtesy was sure to be reciprocated. And Anglicans, Greeks, and Russians, if not united in the bond of a common creed, would become brethren in the Lord.

These fond anticipations, if entertained (and of this there is little doubt), were not put to the test until after the first half of the present century had been passed. Patrological studies had already engaged the attention

of several among the leading minds of the Church of England; the Oxford movement had opened up a new field of enquiry, and given prominence to several questions, which were soon regarded as critical tests of revealed truth. Were Anglican ministers real priests? Were Anglican bishops successors of the apostles? Were the Anglican sacraments anything more than mere ceremonies? Had the Anglican establishment any jurisdiction, except what it derived from the crown? were questions which with many others pressed for a solution. Meanwhile members, high and low, learned and unlearned, belonging to the established Church, were leaving it for Rome, convinced that the former was nothing more than a creature of the state; and many who still remained in it maintained their position only by abandoning the studies which had aroused their suspicions, or by doing violence to their conscience. How was an end to be put to this painful state of doubt and uncertainty? How was the tide of conversion from Anglicanism to Catholicity to be checked? Only in one way, as the defenders of Anglicanism believed, by convincing its members, that, if not the true Church, it was a branch of it. But how was this to be done? By effecting (so these defenders said) intercommunion between the Anglican and Russo-Greek Churches, which latter, having valid sacraments, a valid priesthood, an apostolic origin, all, in fine, that is necessary to constitute a Church, could remedy all the defects inherent in the English establishment. In this view of the case the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, as deriving her descent from the Anglican establishment, cordially sympathized, and whatever may be said about the influx of Russo-Greeks into the United States, or a desire to secure the right of interment for Anglican travellers, as motives for bringing about some sort of union between Episcopalians on the one hand

and Greeks on the other, the real reason of the movement towards such union, which commenced in 1862, was, as just stated, to satisfy the craving of large numbers in the Episcopalian ranks for something with more of the characteristics of a Christian Church than what they possessed under that name. True, such an arrangement might place Churchmen in dangerous proximity to the Czar or Grand Turk. But even the latter was less to be dreaded than the Pope.

In furtherance, therefore, of this scheme, at the general convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church held in New York, October 1862, a joint committe was appointed "to consider the expediency of opening communication with the Russo-Greek Church, to collect authentic information upon the subject, and to report to the next General Convention." On July 1st of the following year, the Convocation of Canterbury appointed a similar committee looking to "such ecclesiastical intercommunion with the Orthodox East, as should enable the laity and clergy of either Church to join in the sacraments and offices of the other, without forfeiting the communion of their own Church." The Episcopal Church of Scotland also encouraged the movement, the success of which, it was hoped, would secure Anglicans the world over valid baptism and a valid ministry. The two committees corresponded with each other, and from time to time reported progress to their superiors. An Eastern Church association was formed in England, and another in the United States, for the purpose of obtaining and publishing information on the doctrines and worship of the Russo-Greek Church; visits were made to Russia; fraternal letters and courtesies were exchanged, and informal conferences were held between Anglican and Russian dignitaries in London, St. Petersburg, and Moscow. All very amusing, especially as any union between Anglican heresy and Russian schism

would have required the sanction of the Queen of England and the Autocrat of all the Russias. Not to be outdone by their transatlantic cousins in fraternal greetings and Christian courtesies, American Episcopalians allowed a Russian ex-priest of doubtful antecedents to celebrate Mass in Trinity Chapel, New York, on the anniversary of the coronation of Czar Alexander II., March 2d, 1865.

The sanction or even toleration of Anglicanism by the Russo-Greek Christians was not, however, to be bartered away for such manifestations of courtesy. They declined to grant anything beyond the privilege of sepulture to Anglicans in consecrated ground, without, however, any proprietary rights. Some were willing to admit that the Anglican Church, by retaining episcopacy and some respect for antiquity, "attached her bark by a strong cable to the ship of the Catholic Church, while the other Protestants, having cut this cable, drifted out to sea;" yet they could recognize in the long run no essential difference between Anglicanism and the other Protestant sects. They found strange novelties in the Thirty-nine Articles; article nineteen, which asserts that the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, was particularly objectionable to them. They expressed serious doubts about the validity of Anglican orders, on account of the flaw in Parker's consecration. They condemned all those Anglican ministers and bishops who, in violation of St. Paul's prohibition (I. Tim. iii. 2.), indulged in the lascivious luxury of second marriage. They refused to recognize the validity of Anglican baptism, because not administered with a trine immersion. It of course followed that they hardly knew whether Anglicans were Christians or pagans. Before a proposition for intercommunion could be entertained, the Anglicans were given to understand, that they would have to omit the *Filioque* in their creed

recognize the Seventh Ecumenical Council, invoke the Blessed Virgin, venerate sacred images, pray for the dead, believe in the seven sacraments, practise trine immersion, accept the doctrine of transubstantiation, and admit that the sacrifice of the Mass can be offered for the living and the dead. These unpalatable discoveries were made by Episcopalians in the course of a correspondence with Greek and Russian dignitaries, from about 1864 to 1870, and have been described by a Protestant writer,[1] whose account of this, as well as of another similar subsequent movement to which we now call attention, has been consulted by us.

Hardly had the Episcopalians recovered from the shock inflicted by the censorious and dictatorial tone with which their overtures for intercommunion were received by the haughty Russo-Greeks, when they were inspired with fresh hopes of success on learning that the famous Dr. Döllinger of Munich had invited a conference of divines favorable to the reunion of Christendom, to meet and consider the best means for promoting so laudable an object. The Doctor had been disappointed in his attempt to formulate a successful protest against the teaching of the Vatican Council. For he had found that that protest had been reëchoed by none but a contemptible number of bad self-styled Old Catholics among his countrymen, while almost all who had admired him as a scholar now shunned him as an apostate. But he hoped by an appeal to heretics, schismatics, and infidels outside Germany to induce some of them to unite on a few Christian principles, as well as on a denial of distinctively Catholic truths, and thus convince the world that he and they, though essentially differing in all else, really constituted a new sect. Here, again, however, he was doomed to disappointment.

[1] Schaff's *Creeds of Christendom*, ii., 545, seq.

The conference out of which the reunion of Christendom was to be effected was held in Bonn, September 14–16, 1874, and was composed of about forty members: Greeks and Russians, as named, to the number of four; a number of English Episcopalians, of whom some are mentioned by name; four American Episcopalians, whose names have been also chronicled; and a large contingent of Old Catholics, all Germans, among whom Dr. Döllinger and the so called bishop Reinkens deserve special mention. Besides Reinkens there were present two other so-called bishops, Browne of Winchester, England, and Kerfoot of Pittsburg, United States. All the rest seem to have been members of the clerical fraternity ranking as priests, preachers, and professors. From such a galaxy of learning and dignity Dr. Döllinger was called to the chair, the bishops occupying seats among the rank and file, while several Lutheran and Evangelical theologians and ministers, attracted by the novelty of the scene, were present, but merely as spectators, to witness the proceedings. The members do not appear to have represented any person or any creed except themselves and their own individual opinions. For, Germans, Greeks, Russians, English, and Americans, they were all without any credentials from the religious organizations to which they belonged respectively.

The first point discussed, probably on the demand of the Russo-Greek members, was the procession of the Holy Ghost. In disposing of this question the conference, in order to placate Eastern prejudice, went so far as to "agree that the way in which the *Filioque* was inserted in the Nicene Creed was illegal," expressing at the same time a wish that "the whole Church would consider whether the Creed could be restored to its primitive form without sacrificing any true doctrine expressed in the present Western form." This much conceded to the Greeks and Russians, they, no doubt, con-

sented to take part in the discussion of the fourteen articles subsequently passed upon by the conference, and decided, at least so far as can be judged from the account before us, by a majority of the members. These articles treated of the Scriptures, Justification, Salvation, works of Supererogation, Number of the Sacraments, Tradition, Episcopal Succession in the Anglican Church, Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, Confession, Indulgences, Prayers for the dead, and the Mass, and all of them savored more or less of the heretical spirit in which they were conceived.

Among the questions discussed at the Bonn Conference was the canon of Scripture. On this point it was decided by the members "that the apocryphal or deutero-canonical books of the Old Testament have not the same canonicity as the books contained in the Hebrew canon." Döllinger and Reinkens voted in favor of an article declaring "that the Church of England, and the Churches derived through her, have maintained unbroken the Episcopal succession." This must have been extremely gratifying to the Anglican members, but was offset by the unpleasant announcement, that the Greeks and Russians, as they had serious doubts on the point, declined to express an opinion before further examination; that examination was never made. Again Döllinger and Reinkens had no hesitation in denying the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, though Canon Liddon of St. Paul's, London, was willing to tolerate it as a "pious opinion."

A second Bonn conference, with a similar purpose, was held August 10–16, 1875. On that occasion a protest was presented, on the part of certain English Episcopalians, against the language which had been used in the previous conference regarding the Eucharist, as being inconsistent "with the language of the English Book of Common Prayer." Canon Liddon dissented

from the protest. Döllinger and Reinkens maintained a discreet silence. It was evident that the Anglicans, who, in order to obtain some sort of recognition from Old Catholics, Russians, and Greeks, had been so profuse in exchanging fraternal greetings with these foreigners, were not of one mind themselves. At this second conference, the old Catholics, Orientals, and Anglicans agreed: 1° to accept the ecumenical synods and doctrinal decisions of the ancient, undivided Church; 2° To acknowledge that the addition of the *Filioque* to the symbol did not take place in an ecclesiastically regular manner; 3° To accept what was taught regarding the Holy Spirit by the Fathers of the undivided Church; 4° To reject every form of expression implying the existence of two principles, or beginnings, or causes in the Trinity. Yet the Orientals were not satisfied, but insisted on a more explicit admission of their doctrine regarding the Procession of the Holy Spirit. To propitiate them the reckless Döllingerites and obsequious Anglicans consented to adopt, as an addition to the four preceding articles, six others, based on the interpretation which the Orientals were pleased to put upon certain statements of St. John Damascene, in reference to the question at issue; although the teaching of this Father on that question has been shown to be consistent with that of not only several Latin but of several Greek Fathers, who wrote long before his time, and insisted that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son as from one principle. Following are some of the propositions which the imperious Orientals compelled their abject petitioners from the West to adopt. "The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father. The Holy Spirit proceeds not from the Son. The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father through the Son," with more of the same sort. Well might Professor Schaff,[1] after giving an ac-

[1] *The Creeds of Christendom*, i., 78.

count of the proceedings at Bonn, remark: "The *Filioque* was surrendered as a peace-offering to the Orientals; but the Orientals made no concession on their part." Yet it has never been heard, that any Anglican who consented to this disgraceful surrender was ever called to account for his base betrayal of a fundamental principle in the creed of his Church. It is unnecessary to add what is well known to all, that the Bonn Conferences brought the Anglicans and the Orientals no nearer to each other than they ever were. Intercommunion with Anglicanism is not and never has been sought by the Russo-Greek Church. And the only condition on which that Church would agree to such an arrangement, is an absolute surrender, not only of the *Filioque*, but of all else which makes Anglicanism what it is. Anglicans, however, still cherish the delusion that the Orientals will meet them half way. In fact, Anglicans seem never to come together in any number without discussing the subject. Even in the last Lambeth Conference,[1] held in 1888, and composed of bishops from all countries where Episcopalians are found, a committee was appointed to consider the Anglican communion in relation to the Eastern Churches, and to the Old Catholics, a party now all but extinct.

It is to be observed that the canon of Scripture, according to the order in which the articles adopted in the first conference at Bonn are given, was the first question considered, as if the members desired at the start to agree upon the books whence they were to draw their proofs. In this matter there is little doubt that the Orientals also succeeded in having their own way, for while the article on "the Canon and the Apocrypha" contradicts the Anglican "Book of Common Prayer," and is in no way inconsistent with any pub-

[1] *Statement of Anglican Bishop Potter, New York*, in *New York Times*, Aug. 13, 1888.

lished belief of the Old Catholics, who were prepared to admit or deny anything, provided that by doing so a union of all heresies could be effected, it harmonized sufficiently with the teaching of the Russo-Greek Church. At first sight it seems vague and ambiguous. But to declare, as it does, that the deutero books of the Old Testament have not the same canonicity as the proto is not denying but asserting the canonicity of the former. For, if a book be canonical at all, it cannot be more or less canonical than another that is so absolutely, since there are no degrees in canonicity, a book being either canonical or non-canonical. The conference, therefore, must have agreed, at the dictation of the Orientals, perhaps convinced by their arguments, to admit the canonicity of the deutero books. And if, by declaring that the deutero books of the Old Testament have not the same canonicity as those contained in the Hebrew canon, the conventicle at Bonn intended to say that the canonicity of the latter was declared by the Synagogue, and that of the former by the Christian Church (the only meaning of which the language there used is susceptible) no one can object to the statement; while it is to be supposed that the conference itself, being composed of Christians, believed that the judgment of the Church in this or any other matter was at least as authoritative as that of the highest tribunal among the Jews.

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Old Testament Canon in use among other Schismatical Bodies in the East.

Besides the schismatical Greeks and Russians, there are among the Orientals other, smaller Christian communities, whose separation from the Church occurred at a much earlier date: as, the Nestorians, Copts or Egyptians, Jacobites, Abyssinians or Ethiopians. Yet all of these, it is well known, include the deutero books in the collection of inspired Scriptures which they still possess. That the canon in use among the Nestorians comprises these books is proved by the testimony of Ebed Jesu, a Nestorian bishop (d. 1318), in his "Admirable Tract containing the Divine Books," etc.[1]—a work in Syriac, translated into Latin by Abraham Echellensis, a Syrian writer (d. 1664). Another Latin translation of the same Tract has been given by Joseph Simon Assemani, also a Syrian writer (d. 1768), in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis*,[2] wherein it is remarked,[3] that Benassal and Abulbarcatus, collectors of canons belonging to the *Egyptian* or *Coptic Church*, enumerate among the sacred books: *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Esther*, *Judith*, *Tobias*. A learned writer on the *Dublin Review*,[4] describing the belief and practice of the members belonging to *the Coptic Church*, declares: "that they do no reject any of the sacred writings which we (Catholics) receive as canonical." Assemani,[5] "states, that Gregory Barhebræus, otherwise called

[1] pp. 3, 5. [2] vol. III., p. 5, seq. [3] Ibid. p. 6, note.
[4] Vol. XXVIII., p. 328. [5] *Bibl. orient.*, vol. iii., 4, note.

Abulfaragius (Aboulfaradje), (d. 1286) Mafrian or Primate of the *Jacobites*, in a work entitled *Horreum Mysteriorum*, has expounded many of the sacred books. A list of the books thus treated is given. And among them are included *Ecclesiasticus* and *deutero Daniel*, with most of the proto books. But *Paralipomenon*, *Esdras*, and *Esther* are wanting. It could not, however, have been on account of any objection to these last, or to the other deutero books, that Barhebræus declined to comment upon them. For Assemani [1] observes, that Barhebræus called the simple Syriac version of the Old Testament "rude," and said that the Septuagint, "which is in the hands of the Greeks and other peoples, is proved by reason and authority to be exact and complete in all its parts." Barhebræus, therefore, received the deutero books, although he failed to comment on several of them, as well as on some of the proto books. Besides, the Syriac copy of the Septuagint must have been well known to him, for he states in the preface to his *Horreum Mysteriorum* that Paul, Monophysite Bishop of Tela, about the beginning of the seventh century, translated the Old Testament of the seventy interpreters from Greek into Syriac.[2] Indeed, translations of the Septuagint into Syriac must have been made long before that. For of one such translation S. Ephrem, a Syrian writer (d. 379), is known to have made use, and even to have cited the deutero books [3] contained therein, as well as the proto books.

It is equally certain that the Bible in use among the Abyssinians or Ethiopians contains the deutero scriptures. In fact, Protestant writers frankly admit this, and Hody [4] has even given a catalogue of the Abyssinian sacred books, showing that the deutero Scriptures are as usual

[1] Ibid., ii., 281. [2] Wiseman, *Horæ Syriacæ*, p. 91.
[3] Kitto, *Cyclop.*, ii., 809; Davidson on *Canon*, *Encycl. Britt.*
[4] *De Bibl. Text*, 650.

interspersed among the others on the Abyssinian canon. Similar testimony is rendered by Job Ludolf (d. 1704,) a learned German Protestant, who devoted great attention to the language, literature, and history of Abyssinia, though he never visited any part of the East. He became acquainted, however, with an Abyssinian abbot named Gregory, from whom he derived much assistance in his studies and some interesting information regarding the canon of Scripture among the Abyssinians. He therefore states,[1] that "They (the Abyssinians) divide the Old Testament, which contains forty-six books, into four principal parts, and they join together certain books evidently dissimilar in their subject. They, whether through *carelessness* or *ignorance* is uncertain, mix *apocryphal* (deutero) books with canonical. Gregory certainly confessed that he had never heard of such a word (apocryphal). The first tome is called the Law and the Octateuch; for it contains eight books, which are called Creation, Exit, Scribes, Numbers, Tabernacles, (the five of Moses) Josua, Dukes (Judges), Ruth. The second tome is called Kings, and contains thirteen books, I. and II. Samuel, I. and II. Hebrews, which, however, they more commonly call the Four of Kings, as is done by the Greeks; I. and II. of Minors or Inferiors (thus they seem to have received the Paralipomenon of the Greeks); I. and II. Esdras, *Tobias, Judith*, Esther, Job, Psalms. The third tome contains five books of Solomon, Proverbs, Discourse (Ecclesiastes), Canticle of Canticles, *Wisdom of Sirach* (Ecclesiasticus). The fourth tome, *Prophets*, contains eighteen books: Isaias, the prophecy of Jeremias and his Lamentations, *Baruch*, Ezechiel, Daniel, twelve minor prophets, Osee, etc. To these they add, by way of conclusion (loco coronidis) two books of *Machabees.*" Ludolf further states, that he learned in the same way that the Abyssinians had all the twenty-seven

[1] *Hist. Æthiopica*, iii., c. 5.

books of the New Testament, which they also divided into four tomes, adding thereto the Constitutions and canons of the apostles as well, probably, as some other really apocryphal books. But whether these are regarded by them as part of the canon does not appear. This, however, is a matter of no consequence, in view of the fact that they do not add to but insert among the proto the deutero books, thus placing it beyond all doubt that they regard the latter as Sacred Scripture. Gregory would probably not have learned from his pupil Ludolf, whether the books contained in the appendix to the Protestant Old Testament were considered canonical or not by all Protestants. It is hardly necesary to remark, further, that the statements of other writers coincide substantially with those of Ludolf. Thus Dr. Davidson admits[1] that "The canon of the Abyssinian Church seems to have had all the books of the Septuagint, canonical and apocryphal (deutero) together, little (no) distinction being made between them;" and David Kay, F. R. G. S., mentions[2] "Copies of the Scriptures, canonical and apocryphal" (deutero), as among the spoils captured at Magdala by the British expedition in 1868..

That the Ethiopic or Abyssinian Bible, therefore, contains the deutero books intermingled with the proto, just as they are now and ever have been found in the Septuagint, there can be no doubt. That the Ethiopic Bible is a translation made from the Septuagint as early as the fourth century, Protestant writers admit.[3] From these facts the reader may well be able to draw his own conclusion. But does it not seem that Ludolf, with the mutilated catalogue of books in the volume constituting his own Bible, was more open to the imputation of *carelessness or ignorance* than the Abyssinians, with their plen-

[1] *Encycl. Britt.* (canon). [2] Ibid. (Abyssinia).

[3] Kitto's *Cycl.*, ii., 916.

ary canon of Sacred Scripture, a canon approved by the great majority of the Christian world? That Ludolf, however, was correct in his statement regarding the books received as canonical by the Abyssinians cannot be doubted, for that statement is confirmed by the testimony of John Nicholson, B.A., Oxford, Ph. D., Tübingen, who, describing[1] the "Ethiopic version," says that "This version of the Old Testament was made from the Greek of the Septuagint, according to the Alexandrine recension, as is evinced, among other things, by the arrangement of the Biblical books, and by the admission of the Apocrypha (deutero books) without distinction." He then gives the same catalogue of books which Ludolf received from Abbot Gregory.

The Armenians, like the other schismatics whose canon has just been described, also possess the Old Testament in all its fulness—a fact which all intelligent Protestants recognize. Indeed, in proving that the Armenian bible includes the deutro books we need only transcribe substantially what has been said by a Protestant writer just cited, Dr. Nicholson.[2] "It appears," says he, "that the patriarch Isaac," in the beginning of the fifth century, "first attempted, in consequence of the Persians having destroyed all copies of the Greek version, to make a translation of the Peschito;" With the assistance of Miesrob, the royal secretary, Isaac completed the undertaking. But two pupils of Miesrob having brought back from the Council of Ephesus "an accurate copy of the *Greek* Bible, the translation from the Peschito was "laid aside," and the decision taken "to commence anew from a *more authentic* text." Miesrob, however, having only an imperfect knowledge of the Greek language, "sent his pupils to Alexandria to acquire accurate Greek scholarship, and, on their return, the translation was accomplished. . . . . In the Old Testament this version adheres

[1] Kitto's *Encycl.*, i., 669. [2] Ibid., 220.

exceedingly closely to the LXX., (but in the books of Daniel has followed the version of Theodotion),"—a peculiarity of the Vulgate. It may be added that in the sixth century the Peschito was employed in correcting this Armenian version, and at a later period the Latin Vulgate was used for the same purpose. No doubt, it was for this reason that Humphrey Hody[1] said that "the Armenian Bible, which has been printed, was translated from the Latin Vulgate." Of course, it follows from all this, however, that the Armenians included the deutero Scriptures in their copies of the Old Testament.

Indeed, it is an undisputed fact that all the early versions of the Old Testament intended for the use of Christians were made from the Septuagint, with the exception of the Peschito, made from the Hebrew, so some say, before the Christian era, but embracing at an early period all the deutero Scriptures found in the Septuagint as well as in the Latin Vulgate, which we owe to St. Jerome.[2] On this point there is no diversity of sentiment between Catholics and Protestants. Indeed, the latter not only concede but insist on the fact. The Coptic or Memphitic, the Thebaic or Sahidic, the Bashmuric—all of Egypt—the Ethiopic, the Georgian, the Slavonic, the Gothic, the Armenian, the figured Syriac, some of them written as early as the first or second century, and none of them later than the ninth, have been all made from the Septuagint and were designed for the use of the several Christian Communities after which they are respectively named, these communities being settled in the East or in countries more or less under Greek influence. In the course of time, the bond of a common faith, by which

[1] *De Bibl. Text.*, 650.

[2] Jerome, in the fifth century, translated from the Hebrew all books in the Hebrew canon at the time, and Tobias and Judith from the Chaldaic. But the other deutero books as contained in the *Vetus Itala* were always included in his version.

they were united to a common centre, was broken, and they were split into jarring factions, each however retaining with more or less error some portion of the creed which it professed on embracing the Christian religion. Provided from the time of their conversion, or soon after, in every instance with a copy or version of the Septuagint, each in its own language, these schismatical communities have thus preserved among them to the present day the Sacred Scriptures as they received them from their first teachers. And in those Scriptures, so far as European scholars have been able to push their enquiries, these books of the Old Testament, which Protestants have rejected, have always been found. If any objection can be urged against the canon of Scripture followed by any of these schismatics, it will be on the score of excess, not of defect. The presence of the prayer of Manasses, III. and IV. Esdras, III. Machabees, in Russian Bibles, or the Gospel of Tatian among the Scriptures of the Nestorians in Hindostan,[1] shows that those whom we have classified as shismatics, whether in the East or West, are disposed to unduly augment, rather than impiously mutilate the canon, though in these two and other such instances that might be cited it might be found that the superfluous books have, after all, no canonical authority among the educated portion of the schismatics by whom they are preserved. Something more than the mere use of a professedly scriptural book by any religious sect is required to prove that its possessors regard it as part of the Bible; were it otherwise, not a few staunch Protestants would be called to account for adopting the Tridentine canon. But whether in some exceptional cases schismatics have, or have not, attempted to canonize apocryphal books, it is certain that all those schismatical bodies named above, and they constitute the great bulk if not the sum total of all such Christians, reckon among

[1] Dublin Review, vol. XVI., p. 145.

the contents of the Old Testament those very Scriptures which are included in the Catholic canon, but have been generally rejected by Protestants as apocryphal.

Indeed, this follows not only from the evidence so far submitted, and derived in a great measure from schismatical and Protestant sources, but from the deliberate statements made by one of the most accomplished Oriental scholars whom Europe has produced.—Abbé Renaudot (d. 1720). He is the author of several learned treatises—*La Perpetuité de la Foi, Historia patriarcharum Alexandrinorum, Défense de la Perpétuité de la Foi, Liturgia Orientalium collectio, etc.*, published in his lifetime. But his learned dissertations on *the Oriental versions of the Scripture, the Arabic versions of the Scripture, the Arabic versions of the Scripture according to the Septuagint, the Books of Sacred Scripture, and the various Oriental versions of them, the antiquity and authenticity of the Sacred Books*, remained in manuscript, until they were printed in vol. I. of the *Cursus Completus Scripturæ Sacræ* by Abbé Migne. It is now proposed to show by extracts from these dissertations, that the Oriental schismatics include the deutero books among the Scriptures of the Old Testament.

"All the Melchite, Jacobite, and Nestorian churches, as many of them (says Renaudot) as venerate the name of Christ in the East, in numbering the books of the Sacred Scripture, follow the same plan with the Roman and Greek Church, and have certainly the same canon, as we call it. For, whatever writings have reached us from their present patriarchs clearly attest that all those books which modern heretics have called apocryphal, because they were not found in the canon of the Hebrews, are considered by the Orientals part of the divine Scriptures, no less than those others, about whose authority all are agreed. Nor, regarding these latter books, was there a different opinion enter-

tained by the ancient Melchite, Jacobite, and Nestorian theologians, out of whose statements a collection of canons has been compiled by Ebnassal, who has inserted the following catalogue in the second chapter of his work." From the catalogue it appears, that all the deutero books were inserted, by the theologians named, among the proto books, with the exception of *Ecclesiasticus* and *Machabees*, which are mentioned as "outside the books which the Faithful in the Church receive." On this Renaudot remarks, that Ebnassal "in this catalogue seems to exclude *Ecclesiasticus*, which Severus, Bishop of Ashmonin, also omits in his life of the patriarch Demetrius; nevertheless, it is enumerated by other authors, but particularly by Abulfaragius, who wrote out a very copious catalogue of Arabic books which were extant eight hundred years before, and on the other hand does not mention *Judith*, *Tobias*, or *Machabees*; but there are extant catalogues of the Sacred books in various collections, and in all of them all the books which we Latins recognize are enumerated as written by divine authority. So also the Nestorian author Ebed Jesu in the Chaldaïc catalogue published at Rome enumerates all of these books, and not one commentary do we see on *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus*, of which some are extant in the Royal Library, written in Arabic and Syriac; often, too, are these books found cited in the writings of Oriental theologians."[1]

Referring to the indiscriminate use made of the versions of Scripture based on the Hebrew and Greek, Renaudot observes, that "after the version of Jerome was consecrated by the public use of the churches, the other ancient one, which has remained intact in many parts of the ecclesiastical offices, was not immediately cast aside, nor that according to the seventy interpreters, which the Church not only has preserved in the entire

[1] *Cursus Compl. S. S.*, Tom. I., col. 701, 702. 703.

Book of Psalms, but has taken from it the books which were not extant in Hebrew. The discipline of the Syrian Christians was exactly the same, even before the Church was rent into three parts (by the two most famous heresies, which alone of the ancient heresies survive—the Nestorian and the Jacobite); which is a certain evidence of extreme antiquity, for, although the faith was subverted, the discipline in that particular underwent no change. All the Syrians from the beginning read in their own language the Scriptures translated from Hebrew copies; they have nevertheless, like the Latins, *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus*, *Judith*, *Machabees*, and certain other parts of the Scripture, which do not occur in the books of the Hebrews. Besides, they have a version according to the seventy interpreters, and although it is not the custom to have it read publicly, nevertheless it is regarded as authoritative among them, as is shown by the commentaries of the Syrian doctors. With that common sentiment of Protestants, which estimates all the value of Oriental versions according to the degree of resemblance which they have to Hebrew copies, they have no sympathy whatever; but as they received from the Church codices of the Scriptures, although they passed to her through the hands of the Jews, who, as St. Augustine says, are our book carriers, the Orientals in like manner receive still from that same mother versions of the same codex."[1]

Then, after copying two indexes of the sacred books, as arranged in Arabic Bibles, Renaudot makes the following remarks: "These indexes show that those who made the Arabic translation from the original Hebrew or the ancient Syriac version, did not so follow the authority of the present Jewish books, as if they thought that books not extant in the Hebrew did not belong to the Scriptures; but they did exactly what

[1] *Cursus Completus S. S.*, I., 634.

had been done by the Roman and all the Latin churches, as well as the Alexandrian and Syrian churches; that, is they acknowledged these same books to be legitimate and divine which were extant in Greek only, instead of rejecting them as apocryphal, which the Protestants have done, contrary to the example and laws of the ancient Church. And this is the constant tradition of all the Oriental Churches, and all these books which are enumerated, whether on the canon of the Jews or on the canon of the Catholic Church, are cited by their theologians in the Arabic translation."[1] Renaudot also cites[2] the testimony of Monophysite bishops in Cilicia and Persia to prove that the Armenians received the deutero books of the Old Testament.

There is therefore on record overwhelming evidence not only from Catholic, but schismatical and Protestant sources, to prove, that those Greek, Russian, and Oriental Christians, between whom and the Catholic Church no bond of union exists, include among the Sacred Scriptures those very books which Catholics have in their canon, but which Protestants reject as apocryphal. These schismatics have been separated from the centre of Catholic unity, some of them for four, others for fourteen centuries. Their exclusion from the pale of the Church was the penalty inflicted on them principally in consequence of error persisted in regarding the Trinity, or the nature of the Redeemer, or the prerogatives of his Vicar. That their canon of Scripture is the same now as it was the day in which they became schismatics is certain. For it cannot be supposed, that after revolting from Rome they would have modelled their canon after a Roman standard, or that Rome would have regulated hers after a pattern prescribed by rebels, had it

[1] *Cursus Completus S. S.*, Tom. I., col. 668. 669.

[2] *La Perpétuité de la Foi, tom.* III., pp. 560, 566, cited by Franzelin, De Div.Trad. et Scrip., p. 441.

been possible for the latter, if not possessed of a canon already, to have agreed on one. The schismatics, therefore, had the deutero books of the Old Testament among their Sacred Scriptures, when they separated from the Catholic Church. But where did they get them, and how was it that they looked upon them as part of God's revealed word? Any sincere Protestant will find these two questions answered by some of his own most respectable writers, in a way which will convince him that to exclude the deutero books from the Old Testament is contrary to Apostolic authority and to the practice of the primitive Christians. Walton, for instance, in his remarks on the Septuagint,[1] says that, "with the sole exception of the Syriac [the Syrians soon after their conversion had a translation of the Septuagint in their own language],[2] *all the versions approved from antiquity by the Church*, viz., the Arabic, the Ethiopic, the Armenian, the Illyrian, the Gothic, the Old Latin before Jerome, were made from *this*" (the Septuagint). Nor does the Greek Church, or the Orientals, acknowledge any other to this day, being content with it alone. It the Fathers and Theologians illustrated by their commentaries, and cited in their writings, Ignatius, both Clements, Justin, Tertullian, Irenæus, Cyril, Basil, Theodoret, Gregory, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, Hilary, and the entire venerable choir of the ancients, those pristine lights of the Church, who were illustrious for their doctrine and sanctity. Out of it they proved the truth of doctrine, and overthrew errors and heresies, drew rules of life and discipline. Yea, it was used by the most holy Fathers in councils provincial and general." And this same Septuagint version, with, remember, the deutero books, "was in use by the Apostles, and the Christians after Christ."[3]

[1] *Proleg.* ix. 1. [2] Ibid. xiii. 11. [3] Ibid. ix. 34.

And "these books," says Dr. Wright,[1] another Protestant writer, "seem to have been included in the copies of the Septuagint, which was generally made use of by the sacred writers of the New Testament. . . . the only copies of the Scriptures in existence for the first three hundred years after Christ, either among the Jews or Christians of Greece, Italy, or Africa, contained these" deutero "books, without any distinction that we know of." Equally candid and significant is the testimony of a later Protestant writer, Professor Welhausen, who says[2] that "the Septuagint came into general use with the Grecian Jews even in the Synagogue. Philo and Josephus used it, and so did the New Testament writers."

With the single exception of Syria, where, however, a version of the Septuagint was early introduced, every country, as soon as it became Christian, was supplied with the Septuagint, or a translation from it in the vulgar tongue, in the first instance by the Apostles, or those who succeeded them in the Christian ministry. Each copy or translation of that venerable Alexandrian codex as well as of the Latin Old Testaments contained the deutero books not only "without any mark of distinction," but actually intermingled among the rest of the books, as the Anglican bishop Marsh[3] confesses. The citations which have been just given, and others produced already, most of them derived from Protestant sources, amount to nothing less than this. If, therefore, it be asked, where did the schismatics get the deutero books? every honest man, whether Protestant or infidel, must answer: In those copies of the Bible which their Catholic forefathers had. If the question be proposed, how was it that the schismatics looked upon these books as part of the revealed word?—for that they now do and have always done so, has been proved—the only reply possible for any one who respects the testimony of the Protestant

[1] Kitto's *Cycl*, I., 553, 554. [2] *Encycl. Britt. Septuagint.*
[3] Comparative View p. 89.

authors already quoted is: These schismatics were so taught by their Catholic ancestors, who were so told by those who converted them to the Christian religion, perhaps an Apostle or some other teacher who spoke in the name and by the authority of the Church.

CHAPTER XIX.

The Canon among the Sects from the First to the Fourteenth Century.

By sects are here meant those fragmentary portions, (national or local) of Christendom, among which all ecclesiastical authority, in the last analysis, resolves itself into individual will; and religious opinion, taking the place of divine faith, is as uncertain as changeable, as absurd, and often as dangerous, as some of the scientific, social, or political theories which sometimes occupy the attention of otherwise well balanced minds; whereas the belief of schismatics, whatever it be, is generally constant, unchangeable, and regulated not by private caprice, but by traditional respect for ancient symbols, or the voice of living teachers. Thus the Oriental schismatics retain almost the same truths and the same errors, which they professed when first separated from the centre of unity; while the sectarists have made so many changes in their creeds, that there is not now, and never has been, a community among them that would be recognized by its founder as the legitimate and logical outgrowth of the society, which he organized.

The authors and members of these heretical sects have been notorious at all times for desecrating the Bible, by falsely interpreting its meaning in support of their errors; and when this could not be done, by mistranslating or corrupting its text, by repudiating such of its books as condemned their wicked principles, or by engrafting on it apocryphal writings, which sanctioned

their blasphemous theories. Long before the Christian era the Samaritans had rejected all of the Old Testament except the Pentateuch. The Sadducees (some say, though others deny it), in addition to other errors, had excluded from the Sacred Scriptures all the books of the Prophets. And the Pharisees had made void the word of God by their tradition.[1] And hardly had the Christian era dawned, when the whole body of the Jews, no longer guided by the Spirit of Truth, denounced as human and apocryphal several books which, according to the best evidence, they had formerly revered as divine.

Irenæus, Tertullian, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Philastrius, Augustine, with other Fathers, whom modern writers as Natalis Alexander, Bergier, etc., have cited, show that the ancient Christian sectarists, like those of recent times, when they did not wrest the Bible to an unnatural and heterodox sense, discarded its authority altogether. And this is true of them all from the first to the last. The heretics of the first three centuries, when they found that the Scriptures stood in their way, very generally denied their divine origin absolutely. In the ages that followed, the propagators of error, with less audacity but more cunning, instead of venturing to question outright the title of God's written word to their obedience, commonly distorted its meaning or vitiated its text, when they met with passages unfavorable to their own perverse opinions.

THE CANON AMONG THE SECTS OF THE FIRST CENTURY.

1. Simon Magus, the first to reject the authority of the Church, was also the first to deny that God was the author of the Scriptures. For, among other errors he taught, according to Epiphanius,[2] that the law was enacted, not by God, but by a certain sinister intelligence; that the prophets were inspired not by the good God,

[1] Mark vii. 13. [2] Nat. Alex. *Hist. Eccl.*, Tom. iii. p. 21.

but by various intelligences; and that all who believed in the Old Testament incurred death.

2. Saturninus rejected altogether the Old Testament, which he declared to be the production of spirits opposed to God, or of that particular wicked spirit who, according to him, ruled the material universe.[1]

3. Basilides attributed the prophecies to angels, and the law to the angelic prince who governed the Jewish people. He himself forged some prophecies, which went by the names of *Barcabas* and *Barcoph*.[2]

4. Cerinthus claimed to have received revelations written by an apostle, and wonderful things shown him by an angel,[3] as the revelation contained in the genuine Scriptures failed to supply him with a proof for his errors. His immediate followers mutilated the Gospel of St. Matthew, repudiated the Epistles of St. Paul, and rejected the Acts of the Apostles.[4]

5. Ebion admitted no part of the New Testament except the Gospel of St. Matthew, but mutilated even that by omitting two chapters, and altered the others in several places.[5] His followers carried their outrages on Sacred Scripture to greater length than their master.[6]

THE CANON AMONG THE SECTS OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

1. Elcesæus admitted only a part of the Old Testament, and a part of the New.[7] His disciples rejected the Epistles of St. Paul and other books and parts of books, according to their caprices. They had in their possession a book which, as they boasted, fell from heaven, and, according to them, would obtain for those who believed it a pardon of sin different from that granted by Christ.[8]

[1] Bergier, *Dictionn. de Théolog.*

[2] Ibid. Nat. Alex. *Hist. Eccl.*, Tom. iii. p. 23; Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* B. iv. c. p. vii.

[3] Ibid. B. iii., s. xxviii. [4] Nat. Alex. *Hist. Eccl.* iii., 24.

[5] Ligouri, *Hist. of Heres.*, Vol. i. p. 3.

[6] Nat. Alex. *Hist. Eccl.* Tom. iii., p. 24. Bergier.

[7] Nat. Alex. *Hist. Eccl.* Tom. iii., p. 285.

2. Cerdo spurned the entire Old Testament; and of the New he admitted only the Gospel of St. Luke, and not even all of that.[1]

3. Marcion did not believe that the Old Testament was inspired by God. Of the four Gospels he received only that of St. Luke, rejecting, however, the two first chapters thereof. He admitted but ten epistles of St. Paul, but excluded therefrom whatever could not be reconciled with his own errors.[2]

4. Tatian taught that the law of Moses was not instituted by God, but by the eon who created the world.[3] He wrote a concordance of the four Gospels, since known as the Gospel of Tatian,[4] and ranked among the apocryphal books. In it he suppressed all those passages of the genuine Gospels which prove that the Son of God was sprung from David according to the flesh.[5]

5. Montanus boasted that he himself was the Paraclete, and encouraged two lewd women, Priscilla and Maxima, to sanction his wicked doctrines by uttering false prophecies.[6]

6. Apelles taught that the oracular utterances of the prophecies proceeded from a spirit that contradicted itself.[7]

THE CANON AMONG THE SECTS OF THE THIRD CENTURY.

1. Manes professed to find such contradictions between the Old and New Testament, that he maintained they could not have been produced by the same God.[8] He therefore attributed the prophets, and in fact the whole of the former, to the evil principle, and claiming to be the Paraclete promised by Christ, he began to propagate his errors.

[1] Bergier, Nat. Alex., *Hist. Eccl.*, Tom. iii., p. 285. [2] Bergier.
[3] Liguori, *Hist. of Heresies.* Vol. i. p. 10.
[4] Fabricius, *Codex Apocryph. N. T.*, Vol. i., pp. 349. 378.
[5] Bergier. [6] Nat. Alex. *Hist. Eccl.* Tom. iii. p. 290. [7] Ibid. p. 293.
[8] Bergier.

2. Tertullian attributed to Barnabas the Epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews,[1] and contended that the sayings of Priscilla and Maxima, the false prophetesses of Montanus, should supersede the teaching of St. Paul with regard to the lawfulness of contracting a second marriage.[2]

From the sectarists already mentioned, and others who did not directly assail written revelation, sprang up innumerable swarms of heretics during the first three centuries — Simonians, Basilidians, Marcionites, Manicheans, Nazarites, Valentinians, Ebionites, Cataphrygians, Alogians, Gnostics, etc.—all repudiating and abusing the word of God, or such parts thereof as manifestly condemned their own absurd and impious theories, and even in many instances fabricating gospels, epistles, prophecies, revelations, and visions in support of the blasphemous opinions which they advocated as fundamental principles of the Christian religion. The wildest chimeras of a disordered brain, or the vilest conceptions of a corrupt heart, were mingled with the parables of Our Lord, the utterances of the prophets, and the writings of the Apostles. It was held that some of the prophecies were spoken by angels, and others by Satan. One Gospel would be received and all the others with St. Paul be flung aside, or a Gospel as well as St. Paul's writings impiously curtailed. Yet St. Paul had his defenders among the sectarists, for some of them contended that he alone knew the truth. By some of them the Gospel of St. John and the Apocalypse were ruthlessly repudiated. To others the writings of the Prophets and Apostles were the only apocryphal Scriptures; of course it was the duty of all who so believed to promulgate such doctrine as contradicted Prophets and Apostles, and this was faithfully done. In fact, the Old

[1] Nat. Alex. *Hist. Eccl.* Tom. iii., p. 308.

[2] Rohrbacher, *Hist. Univer. De L'Egl.*, Tom. v., p. 332.

Testament as well as the New met with scant reverence among the new lights of the time, by whom it was considered that Ecclesiastes, written by Solomon when henpecked by strange women, could not have been divinely dictated. The Canticle of Canticles, too, was rejected as an impious song by some early as well as later heretics. To all this horrible profanation, and blasphemous perversion of God's holy word, must be added attempts at counterfeiting the contents of the Old Testament, and the Gospels and Epistles of the New. Even the Psalms of David, which from the beginning were used in the public service of the Church, were in one instance superseded by hymns chanted in honor, not of God, but of the impious wretch Paul of Samosata, who dared usurp God's own place in God's own sanctuary. Not a few of those primitive heretics were converted Jews, who as Christians were strongly tinctured with their early prejudices. The only Gospel which they received was that of St. Matthew; and Apostate, not Apostle, was the name by which St. Paul was known among them. St. Irenaeus,[1] Eusebius,[2] Philastrius,[3] Epiphanius,[4] Augustine,[5] and other early Christian writers, show that all those heretics who endeavored to corrupt the faith of the primitive Church, when they did not actually repudiate the divine Scriptures; so corrupted, interpolated, and mutilated them, that they hardly retained any resemblance to the sacred records intended by God for the instruction of mankind. But this treatment of the Bible has been a characteristic of Christian sects at all times, modern as well as ancient.

[1] *Advoc. Haeres.*, L. I., c. i., xvii., xxii., xxvi.; L. III., c. ii., xi., xii., xiii. (*Bibl. Max. V. Patr.*)

[2] *Hist. Eccl.*, B. III., c. 28. iv., c. 22, 29. v., c. 13, 18, 28. vi., c. 12. 38. vii., c. 25, 30.

[3] *Haeres.* 13, 40. (*Bibl. Max. V. Patr.*)

[4] *In haeres.*, 66.

[5] *De Moribus, Eccl. Cath. Contra Faustum, etc., passim.*

THE CANON AMONG THE SECTS OF THE FOURTH AND FIFTH CENTURIES.

Unfortunately for the peace and prosperity of Christendom, heresy, with the close of the third century, ceased not its attacks on the faith, though it changed its tactics. For, instead of openly denying the authority of Scripture, or substituting for it human compositions, it took issue with those conclusions which reason, guided by the teaching of the Church, deduced from the principles proclaimed by the Scripture. Donatists, Arians, Pelagians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Monophysites, etc., waged incessant war on dogma and morals throughout the fourth and fifth centuries, and some of them long after. Yet, with the exception of St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, at first admitted but afterwards rejected[1] by the Arians, and the Book of Wisdom, repudiated by the Pelagians or rather Semipelagians,[2] not a word was said by any of the sects against a single book on the canon of either Testament. The Eunomians, however, in the fourth century contended, that the writings of their founder Eunomius were more authoritative than the Gospels ;[3] and when hard pressed by texts from the Prophets or Apostles, the Anomæans, who like the Eunomians were nothing but an Arian faction, replied, that the Prophets and Apostles had written as mere men.[4] In the same century the Priscillianists appealed to aprocryphal books in support of their errors.[5] In the fifth century Vigilantius, in order to prove one of his heretical opinions, cited as canonical the apocryphal Fourth Book of Esdras.[6]

[1] Theodoret, *Preface to Ep. to Hebr.*

[2] Augustine, *Prædest.* SS., L. i., c. 14.

[3] Hierony. *Liber adversus Vigilantium.*

[4] Nat. Alex. *Hist. Eccl.* Tom. iv., p. 54.

[5] Liguori, *Hist. of Heres.*, Vol. i., p. 90; Nat. Alex. *Hist. Eccl.* Tom. iv., p. 66.

[6] Ibid., Tom. v., p. 13.

THE CANON AMONG THE SECTS, FROM THE SIXTH TO THE TENTH CENTURY, INCLUSIVE.

Whether the anti-Christian spirit of heresy was otherwise occupied, or had found that further efforts in those ages to upset the common belief in the supernatural origin of the books on the canon must end in failure, it allowed five centuries to pass without renewing the contest in that direction. But most of the old errors in disguise, and new ones under attractive forms, all, however, when unmasked, hideous, absurd, arrogant, aggressive, or blasphemous, continued to unsettle the minds of men, and disturb the peace of Christendom.

THE CANON AMONG THE SECTS OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.

Not until the eleventh century had been reached, was there any direct and notable assault made on the canon of Scripture, or on the divine authority of either Testament. In the early part of that century the Bogomilists, (Bulgarian for the beloved of God), who were followers of an errorist named Basil, a physician under a monk's habit, rejected the Books of Moses and the rest of the Sacred Scripture, except the Psalter, the 16 Prophets, the Acts of the Apostles, their Epistles, and the Apocalypse.[1] In the same century two ecclesiastics of France, Stephen and Lisosius, taught that all the Scriptures say about the Trinity and the creation of the world is mere nonsense, as the heavens and the earth are from eternity, and never had a beginning.[2]

THE CANON AMONG THE SECTS OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY.

The Albigenses and Cathari generally reprobated the Old Testament as the work of the devil; but it seems that a few of them rejected only the Law and the his-

[1] Nat. Alex. *Hist. Eccl.* Tom. vi., p. 479.

[2] Liguori, *Hist. of Heres.*, Vol. i., p. 247.

torical books. While such was the treatment which the Old Testament received among these heretics, they disdained not to consult apocryphal books, as the *Vision of Isaias*, for the purpose of edification. Instead, however, of rejecting or mutilating the New Testament as they did the Old, they added to its contents, by inserting therein a fifteenth Epistle of St. Paul, and a work attributed to John the Apostle.[1] The same century also witnessed the birth of the Waldensian sect, which, like the two preceding, as well as all others before and since, was soon divided and subdivided into innumerable factions, so that it is difficult, indeed impossible, to trace the history or define the creeds of these mediæval sectarists. All that can be said about the views, rather errors, of the Waldenses regarding the Bible, is that, though they made a very bad use of it, they do not appear to have rejected any of its books. The writer whom we have last cited, though a Protestant, frankly admits, while referring to the "Waldenses," "that the common opinion, which gives them the honor of having made a careful separation between the apocryphal (deutero) of the Old Testament, and the (proto) canonical books, is false and erroneous in every point. . . . The Waldenses of the middle ages were acquainted, and could be acquainted, with the Vulgate only, as it was generally received in their time,"[2] when, as now it contained the deutero books. We are further informed on the same page that "of the few supposed Waldensian manuscripts of the New Testament there are two which also contain *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus*."[3] It was through the Walden-

[1] Reuss, *Hist. of the Canon of the H. S.*, pp. 263, 264. In the twelfth century the Publicani, foreign sectarians supposed to be connected with the Albigenses or Waldensians, appeared in England. They rejected all the Scriptures except the Gospels and canonical Epistles. *The Truth about John Wyckliffe*, p. 195.

[2] Reuss. *Hist. of the Canon of the H. S.* p. 264. [3] Ibid.

sians that the Reformers of the sixteenth century endeavored to connect themselves with Christian antiquity. But the attempt was a failure, for Waldensianism differed as much from common Protestantism, as (even more than) Calvinism differed from Church of Englandism. Besides, had it been shown that Waldensianism was Protestantism, how could the latter have cleared at a single bound the gaping chasm which separated the twelfth century from the Apostolic age? Reuss, when he made the preceding admissions, declared that he did so "for the sake of historical truth." All other Protestants, as well as he, knew that the deutero books were never separated from, but remained mixed among the proto books of the Old Testament until the time of Luther. But few of these Protestants have had the candor to denounce the denial of that historical fact as "false and erroneous in every point."

THE CANON AMONG THE SECTS OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

In this century an anonymous defender of Abbot Joachim, who had broached certain errors, which he afterwards recanted, wrote a book entitled the *Eternal Gospel.* It contained several heretical propositions: among others, that the doctrine of Joachim was superior to that of Christ, and therefore to that of the Old Testament; that the Gospel of Christ is not to edification; that, as the Old Testament had been, so should the New be, cancelled; and that after the year 1260 it should no longer have authority.[1]

In the same century the Albigensians were engaged in making what they no doubt considered improvements in their creed. They already believed that there were two creators, one benevolent, the other malevolent. To the latter they, as we have seen, ascribed the Old Testament,

[1] Natalis Alexander, *Hist. Ecclesiastica Vet. et Nov. Test.*, Tom. vii., p. 78.

which, as a matter of course, they rejected, except such parts as they found in the New Testament, which they attributed to the former. But in the course of time they devised other impious tenets regarding God, and for reasons which they professed to find in the Old Testament called its author "a liar and a homicide." [1]

[1] Nat. Alex. *Hist. Eccl.* Tom. vii., p. 66.

CHAPTER XX.

The Canon among the Sects from the Fourteenth to the Sixteenth Century.

We have now reached that period in the early part of which Wyckliffe lived, flourished, and afflicted England, and not only England, but a great part of Europe, with his pernicious errors. For there is no doubt that he planted the seed which in the next two centuries grew up and ripened into a harvest of infidelity, disorder, and crime, wherever English influence extended, or the English language was understood, or English writings were translated into the speech of any other country. There were at the time, as there had always been and always will be advocates of heretical opinions. Wyckliffe seems to have been the only man of his age who, besides propounding doctrines so monstrous that Protestants, to their credit, would now be ashamed to defend them, is said to have repudiated that Canon of the Old Testament, which Christendom both East and West revered as divine. But that he really did so may nevertheless be doubted,

Wyckliffe, however, although on linguistic grounds wholly incompetent for such a task, is commonly supposed to have written an English translation of the Bible—the first book of the kind, according to many Protestants, that ever appeared in that language. In this supposed translation Dr. Wright[1] of Trinity college

[1] Kitto's *Cycl.*, *Deutero canonical*, I., p. 556.

says that Wyckliffe "substituted another prologue for Jerome's, wherein, after enumerating the 'twenty-five' books of the Hebrew canon, he adds—'Whatever book is in the Old Testament, besides these twenty-five, shall be set among the Apocrypha, that is, without authority of belief. Now the words here attributed to Wyckliffe are part of the Preface of "an uncertain tract," as Hody[1] calls it, referring to the books contained in the Sacred Scriptures and written in Old English. Hody has copied the preface, and from it it appears that the writer considered that the Old Testament was composed solely of the books on the Hebrew canon, which he divides into 25 instead of 22 or 24; that he followed Jerome's Prologus Galeatus, and that, as Judith was taken "for a book of Holy Scripture" by the Council of Nice, he was willing to add it to the number, and by separating Nehemias from Esdras, to make of the whole "27 books of belief." Hody adds that in the first fly leaf of the book is written: "This book seems to have been written by John Wyckliffe," and that the handwriting is that of Obadias Walker, a Catholic. Hody's conclusion is that the preface in question was written by some one else than Wyckliffe. So far there is nothing, therefore, to prove, that Wyckliffe's crimes against religion included any attempt at mutilating the canon. And if he ever translated the Bible or any part of it, his translation was but the translation of a translation—that made by St. Jerome. For he knew no language except that of his native land and Latin. His ignorance of Greek, as well as of Hebrew, a fact admitted by his eulogists,[2] to say nothing of that other consideration, that in his time and long before his countrymen had the Scriptures in their own language,[3] renders it extremely doubtful

[1] *De Bibl. Text.*, p. 658. [2] Kitto Cycl., *Versions.*

[3] *Chamber's Book of Days*, i., 162; Sir Thomas More, Archbp. Cranmer, vide Lingard. *Hist. of Eng.*, iii., 155, note.

that he had the temerity—though he had a large supply of that commodity—or considered it necessary, to undertake a translation of the Bible.

Regarding the supposed translation of Wyckliffe, there is much uncertainty, as is evident from an article on *versions*[1] by Dr. Davidson. This writer assumes as a fact that such a work was really written, and that it "was finished about the year 1380," but adds that "according to Baber, another version was made in the fourteenth century, posterior to Wyckliffe's, with which it is frequently confounded," and "it may be doubted, whether Wyckliffe's version has yet been published even as regards the New Testament," while "the Old Testament has not yet been published, but it is now in course of publication." Eight years after this statement was made, the readers of the Dublin Review[2] were informed that Wyckliffe's "version of the Bible had recently been published."

Yet, for the reasons already stated, and others to be submitted, it must seem extremely doubtful whether the heresiarch was the author of the version just mentioned, or whether he ever wrote any version at all. Probably the most he did do in the matter was to avail himself of the English versions then in existence, and thus prepare one or more editions adapted to his own principles, have them copied, and distributed by those firebrands he had in his service, whom he called *poor priests*, and whom, after being trained in his own school, he sent in all directions to propagate his heretical doctrines, and excite a spirit of sedition among the people. It must be admitted that Wyckliffe and his apostles, in their efforts to accomplish a religious and political revolution among their countrymen, met with remarkable success. This is too well attested by the violent and widespread opposition to civil as well as ecclesiastical

[1] Kitto's *Cyclop.* [2] Vol. XXXV, p. 420, year 1853.

authority, which convulsed English society, even before the awful death which put an end to the turbulent career of the wretched apostate.

The English versions made before Wyckliffe's time being not now extant, it is impossible to say whether the translation published as his is an original work, or one manufactured from materials which he found at hand in the English translations which had been already written. The latter supposition is probably the correct one, if the conjecture that Wyckliffe had anything whatever to do in preparing a new English version of the Bible be not wholly preposterous. Even were it in our power to compare the translations of older writers with that ascribed to Wyckliffe, we should look in vain for evidences to prove that the latter was actually executed by him. In fact, Dr. Davidson hesitates to say that Wyckliffe was the author of the version commonly attributed to him. "There are (says this writer) indications of his (Wyckliffe's) having had assistance in the work perhaps from various individuals."[1] And the Dr. concludes that "The subject, however, is involved in considerable doubt; and he that trusts to the common account given of this early reformer as a translator of the Bible may probably be misled in his opinions."[2] Yet Lingard, adopting "the common opinion," says "Wycliffe made a new translation."[3] But in this matter the celebrated historian seems for once to have dismissed his witnesses without the usual cross-examination. For Protestant writers, who have carefully weighed all the evidence in the case, and must as Protestants have been disposed to grant Wyckliffe all that is claimed for him by "common opinion," express themselves on the subject, as we have just seen, with considerable hesitation. Besides, Chamber's *Book of Days*, a work written under Protestant influence, and much lat-

[1] Kitto's *Cyclop.*, *Version.* [2] Ibid [3] *Hist. of England*, Vol. iii., p. 155.

er than Lingard'd History, refers to Wyckliffe as a translator with the same reserve which marks the statement of Davidson. Referring to a translation of the Bible into English, which was made in the latter half of the fourteenth century, the *Book of Days* says, it "is known as Wyckliffe's Bible, as being the work of that reformer himself, or, at least, of his followers. There are two texts of the English version, *differing considerably from each other,* which are printed side by side in the edition in 3 vols. *quarto* edited by Forshall and Madden."[1] Both texts could not have proceeded from Wyckliffe. And where is the evidence that he is the author of either?

Although Hallam,[2] writing about 1840, refers, like some others, to "The translation of Wicliffe" without any apparent doubt that such a work was or had been actually in existence, later writers are by no means so positive in their remarks on the subject. Thus Mr. George F. Marsh, an American, who has devoted much attention to the question in his *Lectures on the English Language,* published in 1863, although an ardent Protestant, as shown by his frequent use of *Popish and Romish,* expresses himself regarding the supposed translation of Wyckliffe in a way to confirm, rather than dissipate, the suspicions of a reader disposed to doubt that a Wyckliffian version of the Bible into English ever existed. For, after rejecting the supposition of some "that the name of Wycliffe was but a myth, the impersonation of a school of reformers," Mr. Marsh adds: "Still, the *extreme uncertainty* of the evidence which identifies any existing manuscript as an actual production of the translator Wycliffe, and the great *stylistic differences* between the *works usually ascribed to him,* require us to use great caution in speaking of the characteristics of

[1] Vol i., p. 162.

[2] *Literature of Europe,* Part I., ch. iii., § 53.

his diction."[1] Elsewhere Mr. Marsh calls attention to several remarkable facts which he discovered while examining Wyckliffe's supposed version and the genuine writings of that reformer. We thus learn that "The language of Wycliffe's Testament differs nearly as much from the religious prose writings of his contemporary and follower, Chaucer, as does that of our own Bible from the best models of literary composition in the present day; and it is a still more remarkable and important fact, that the style which Wyckliffe himself employs in his controversial and other original works is a very different one from that in which he clothed his translation."[2] The natural conclusion to be drawn from this is, that the translation attributed to Wyckliffe is not his, but that of an older writer, and that Sir Thomas More was right when he said, there were English translations of the Sacred Scriptures long before the time of Wyckliffe. This conclusion, though perceived by Mr. Marsh, is not admitted by him. But his reasons for rejecting it will bring conviction to few unprejudiced minds. Another very suggestive fact is, as remarked by Mr. Marsh, that "The translations of the texts cited by Wycliffe himself, in the controversial works most confidently ascribed to him, by no means agree literally with the version of the New Testament, and of a part of the Old, which he is believed to have executed."[3] Does it not therefore seem to follow that the author of these "controversial works" could not have written the translation in question? The learned lecturer does his best to meet this difficulty, but with very moderate success. Again our respected fellow citizen tells us that "There is a good deal of difficulty in identifying any extant manuscript as certainly the work of Wycliffe; but there are several which are

[1] *First Series*, p. 167, note. [2] Ibid., pp. 625, 626.

[3] *Second Series*, ibid., p. 340, note.

ascribed to him with every appearance of probability.[1] Are not, therefore, Wyckliffe's admirers asking too much when they would have people receive as a translation of that ecclesiastical demagogue one of the two texts which Messrs. Forshall and Madden have condescended to prepare for the public. Referring to this edition, Mr. Marsh observes that "the older text, from Genesis to *Baruch* iii. 20, is believed to be the work of Hereford,[2] an English ecclesiastic; the remainder of the Old Testament and Apocrypha is supposed, and the whole of the New Testament almost certainly known to have been translated by Wycliffe, while the later text of the entire Bible is ascribed to Purvey."[3] Whether Wyckliffe translated the Bible, or any part of it, is therefore a question which, in view of all the evidence, seems to demand a negative answer. But it does not appear that he, like his modern apologists, must plead guilty of mutilating the canon of Scripture. Even Hereford and Purvey, his misguided associates, recoiled from such a sacrilegious act. For the version attributed to them or at least to Hereford contains, "all the Apocryphal Books, so called, excepting the fourth book of Esdras."[4] That John de Wyckliffe, however, impelled by disappointed ambition, attempted to overturn altar and throne by a sacrilegious use of the Bible, and that his efforts in that direction were, though long after his death, for a time completely successful, few who have studied the history of England will venture to deny.

When the preceding sketch of Wyckliffe was almost completed, it was learned that a work just referred to,

[1] *Second Series*, p. 366.

[2] At first a Wyckliffite, but afterwards reconciled to the Church. *The Truth about John Wyclif*, by J. Stevenson, S.J., p. 121.—

[3] *Second Series*, p. 344.—Purvey was another Wyckliffite.

[4] *The Truth about John Wyclif*, 106.

The "Truth about John Wyclif," London, 1885, had appeared. The name of the learned writer has been already mentioned. Referring to Wyckliffe's connection with the version commonly ascribed to him, this writer says: "If any portion of the undertaking belongs to him, it is the version of the New Testament, and even on this point his Oxford editors, Forshall and Madden, speak with considerable reserve. . . Possibly, then, he took no active part in the translation of the entire New Testament; certainly he had nothing to do with the version of the Old Testament. . . Perhaps the version of the New Testament may be his, perhaps not; certainly no more."[1] Such is the conclusion reached by a conscientious critic, after a careful study of the life and labors of Wyckliffe as portrayed by Wyckliffe's contemporaries, and those now engaged in editing his works. Thus modern research leads to the exposure, one by one, of the many fictions which constitute the substratum on which the Protestant system rests.

THE CANON AMONG THE SECTS OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

This century also verified the words of St. Paul, when he declared that "there must be also heresies."[2] For it contributed its full quota to the black list of turbulent and obstinate innovators, who have in every age conspired against divine truth. In that quota, however, there appears but one who, besides his other assaults on the common belief of Christendom, boldly attacked the sacred document by which, as interpreted by the Church, that belief had all along been maintained. That one was Herman Ruissvich, a Batavian by birth. His career commenced in the fifteenth and extended into the sixteenth century. He was condemned for his errors in 1499, and died soon after, having obstinately contended

[1] *The Truth about John Wyclif*, pp. 106, 107. [2] I. Cor. xi. 19.

that the faith of Christians was a fable, the Bible an absurd fiction, and the Gospel a vain delusion.[1]

THE CANON AMONG THE SECTS OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

Herman was succeeded by a horde of heretics, whose principles were less repulsive and blasphemous, and thus better calculated to corrupt the faith and morals of Christendom, by imposing on the credulity and flattering the passions of mankind. In a work like the present, mention can be made only of such in that horde, as made themselves notorious by rejecting that canon which they as well as their forefathers had been taught to revere, as the only true catalogue of inspired books. Foremost in the horde is Martin Luther, whose true patronymic was Luder, which Martin, on account of its vulgar meaning, exchanged for a more euphonious name, by which he has since been known. This remarkable man was born of humble but pious Catholic parents at Eisleben, Upper Saxony, in the year 1483. He became an Augustinian monk in 1505, was ordained priest in 1507, but afterwards divested himself of his religious habit and violated his monastic vows. Among the errors he broached were the opinions, which he propounded in reference to the Sacred Scriptures. In 1526, although his knowledge of Hebrew and Greek was far from extensive,[2] he commenced a German translation of the Bible from the languages in which it was originally written, a work which he completed in 1534, placing the deutero books of the Old Testament by themselves, between it and the New, under the title of "Apocrypha; that is, Books which are not to be considered as equal to Holy Scripture, and yet are useful and good to read."[3]

[1] Nat. Alex., *Hist. Ecclesiast.* Tom. viii., p. 100.

[2] Hallam, *Literature of Europe*, Part I., c. vi., § 37.

[3] Kitto's *Cycl.*, *Deutero canonical.*

Moreover, Luther throughout his prefaces, one of which, in imitation of St. Jerome, he prefixed to each of the books in his German translation, as well as throughout his other writings, has expressed himself in such a way as to convince his readers that there were several proto books of the Old Testament, and deutero in the New, whose canonicity he either openly denied or doubted. Thus, although he retained Esther on the roll of sacred books, he is accused of having held that it was not entitled to a place therein; and the charge appears to be well founded; for in his *Table Talk* he declared to his confidential friends in his own arbitrary style: "The Book of Esther I toss into the Elbe." "I am so an enemy to the Book of Esther, that I would it did not exist; for it Judaizes too much, and hath in it a great deal of heathenish naughtiness."[1] Again "Job (which he preserved in his German Old Testament) may have thought what is written in his book, but he did not pronounce these discourses. A man does not speak thus when he is tried."[2] What Luther thought of the writings of Solomon may be inferred from the following. "The Proverbs of Solomon are (he says) a book of good works; they are collected by others, who wrote them when the king, at table or elsewhere, had just uttered his maxims. There are added the teachings of wise doctors."[3] Speaking of Ecclesiastes, "This book (he remarks) ought to be more complete; it wants many things; it has neither boots nor spurs, and rides in simple sandals, as I used to do when I was still in the convent. Solomon is not its author, etc."[4] "Ecclesiastes and Canticles (he continues) are, besides, books not of one piece; there is no order in these books; all is confused in them, which fact is explained by their origin. For, Canticles, too, were composed by others from the sayings of Solomon."[5] In his

[1] Kitto's *Cycl.*, *Esther*. [2] Reuss, *Hist. of the Canon of the H. S.*, p. 331.
[3] Ibid. p. 330. [4] Ibid. [5] Ibid.

work *De Serv. Arbit.* addressed to Erasmus, speaking of the Hebrew canon, "which canon (he remarks) you do not a little reproach, when you compare the Proverbs and the Love-song, as you sneeringly call it, with the two Books of Esdras, and Judith, Susannah, the Dragon, and the Book of *Esther;* but though they have this last in their canon, it is in my judgment (he says) more worthy than all of being excluded from the canon."[1] With the most liberal construction that can be put on his language, it is impossible to reach any other conclusion than that Luther did not believe that the books of Solomon were dictated by the Holy Ghost, and that Esther was canonical. His apologists would have us believe that, when he said, "Esther was more worthy than all of being excluded from the canon," he meant Esther of the Septuagint. But in vain; for Luther, when he so wrote, was referring to the Hebrew, not the Septuagint Old Testament. Indeed, it is difficult to suppose that Luther's view of the Old Testament was that, which any class of Christians ever entertained. Thus he says: "The Books of Kings are a hundred thousand steps in advance of those of Chronicles, and they also deserve more credit. Still, they are only the calendar of the Jews containing the list of their kings and their kind of government."[2] Ordinary readers supposed that these books also contained an account of God's dealings with his chosen people. Again, "Moses and the prophets preached, but we do not there hear God himself. . . . When God himself speaks to men, they hear nothing but grace and mercy."[3] Most people, Protestants as well as Catholics, have always believed that, whether it was *Moses* or the *prophets* who *preached*, it was God Himself who did the *preaching*, and then it was *grace* and *mercy* that were heard. Is there not good reason for suspecting, that Luther's

[1] Kitto's *Cycl., Esther.*

[2] Reuss, *Hist. of the Canon of the H. S.*, p. 331.

[3] Ibid.

canon of the Old Testament was determined more by an arbitrary and capricious will, than by a critical and deliberate judgment?

Luther's canon of the New Testament seems to have been regulated on the same principle, indeed more so; for, having, while promulgating his canon of the Old Testament, substituted abject submission to rabbinical authority for the obedience which by his vows he owed to the Church, it is surprising that, at the dictation of his Jewish teachers, he did not utterly repudiate the Christian Scriptures. There was one book, however, in these Scriptures for which he seems to have entertained a satanic hatred, the Epistle of St. James. "This epistle (says he) in comparison with the writings of John, Paul, and Peter, is a right strawy epistle, being destitute of an evangelic character."[1] Referring to this criticism, a learned Protestant writer[2] is constrained to say that Luther "was influenced not so much by historico-critical, as by dogmatic views." Such "views" were too often at the bottom of Luther's conclusions. Ever since he had broken his solemn vows to God, he seems to have determined on extirpating throughout Christendom what all but himself considered good works. And as they constituted a large part of the ingredients in the pill compounded by St. James, it was not to be expected that the genial ex-monk, who had taken unto himself a wife, and had granted[3] two to a princely patron, would taste, much less gulp down, such nauseous medicine without a strong protest. Hence, in his preface to James and John, he querulously remarks, that "this James does nothing but urge on to the law and its works, and writes so confusedly and inconsistently, that

[1] *Preface to the New Testament.*

[2] Dr. Wright of Trinity College, Dublin, on *Epistle of St. James*, in Kitto's *Cycl.*

[3] Bossuet's *Variations*, B. VI.

it appears to me like as if some good pious man got hold of a number of sayings from the Apostles' followers, and then flung them on paper; or it is probably written by some one after the Apostles' preaching."[1] Luther therefore could not have held that the Epistle of St. James was divine.

Reuss[2] admits that Luther "thought himself bound" by the views which he advocated "to dispute the canonical dignity .... of the Epistles of James and Jude, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse. He did not, indeed, suppress them in his editions, but from the first he relegated them to the end of the volume; and in the tables of the contents placed at the top, he separated their titles from those of the books reputed to be canonical, all the more significant, that the twenty-three first alone were numbered, while the four last were not." And Luther's futile reasons for this novel and un-Christian arrangement were, "the Epistle of James derives justification from works; in interpreting the Old Testament it contradicts Paul; it does not speak of Christ, His death, His resurrection, His Spirit; it speaks of a law of liberty, while we know from Paul that with the law are associated bondage, sin, anger, death. The Epistle to the Hebrews in three places (ch. vi., x., xii.) refuses repentance to sinners after baptism contrary to all the gospels and to all Paul's epistles. The Epistle of Jude, also, when judged by what is fundamental in the Christian faith, is useless. In the Apocalypse there are only images and visions .... threats and promises .... while no one knows what he means, and after all, Christ is neither taught nor acknowledged. It may be compared to the Fourth Book of Esdras; the inspiration of the Holy Spirit is not perceptible in it."[3]

[1] Kitto's *Cycl.*, *James.*

[2] *Hist. of the Canon of the H. S.*, p. 325.

[3] Ibid., pp. 326, 327.

After reading Luther's argument against the Apocalypse, Dr. Davidson remarked: "This reasoning is manifestly so inconsequential, and the style of criticism so bold, as to render animadversion unnecessary." [1] By several Protestant critics, both in Germany and England, it is supposed that the Epistle to the Hebrews was not written by St. Paul but by Apollo, a conjecture for which they are indebted to Luther. [2] Luther's translation determined the form and tone of the Bible in almost all Protestant countries, and long retained his prefaces at the head of each book. There are some editions in which these four books, Epistle of James, Epistle of Jude, Hebrews, and the Apocalypse, to all of which Luther objected, are set apart by themselves and stigmatized *Apocrypha*. In fact, what Protestants call the *Antilegomena* (deutero of the New Testament), that is, the books just mentioned, as well as the Second Epistle of Peter and the Second and Third of John, are headed by the words "Apocrypha of the New Testament" [3] in the Lunenberg edition of Luther's Bible, published in 1618, that is, sixty-eight years after Luther's death. [4]

Luther's view of the deutero books in the Old as well as the New Testament was adopted by Martin Chemnitz, [5] and Johann Brentz, [6] both leading German reformers, who, though somewhat younger than Luther, belonged to the same century; and by many other less brilliant lights, whose belief must have been considerably influenced by the critical remarks contained in Luther's prefaces. Even the centuriators of Magdeburg were favorably impressed by Luther's views. They, however, with other Lutherans, strenuously defended the canonicity of the Apocalypse, that book being then

[1] Kitto's *Cycl.*, Vol. II., p. 619. [2] Ibid., I., p. 826.
[3] Reuss, *Hist. of the Canon of the S. S.*, p. 338.
[4] Kitto's *Cycl.*, II., p. 508.
[5] *Examen. Sessio* VI., *Conc. Trid.* [6] *Conf. Wittenberg.*

considered by all good Protestants the most useful in the entire Bible, and absolutely indispensable to the success of their cause; as no one could read it, so they believed, without being convinced that Rome was the Apocalyptic Babylon, and the Pope that veritable anti-Christ revealed to St. John.

John Calvin, a contemporary of Luther, though with him equally opposed to the deutero books of the Old Testament, was more indulgent to those of the New, yet he seemed to have been somewhat doubtful about the Second Epistle of Peter, for he observes with regard to it that "notwithstanding some affinity in style, the discrepancies between it and the former (I. Peter) are such as to indicate that they had not the same author." [1] Since Calvin's time it has been rejected by several learned Protestants, as Grotius, Scaliger, Salmasius, Semler, etc.[2] Bolten, Grotius, Michaelis, and others, following in the steps of Luther, have also called in question the apostolic origin, if not the canonicity of the Epistle of Jude.[3] In fact, there is not any of the deutero books belonging to the New Testamement whose divine origin has not been denied by Protestant writers, especially in Germany; while the Bible as a whole has been assailed by non-Catholic scholars wherever Protestantism has a following, in a spirit of criticism decidedly more worthy of avowed infidels than professing Christians. While, thus, on the one hand, Protestant biblicists have been endeavoring to reduce not a few of the sacred books to the level of profane writings, others of the same class have been exerting their talents to prove that certain compositions, confessed at all times to be purely human, were of equal authority with anything the Apostles had written. The apostolical canons and constitutions, for example,

[1] *Comment. in Ep. Cath.*

[2] Kitto's *Cycl.*, Vol. II., p. 508.

[3] Ibid., p. 172.

with the various liturgies ascribed to St. Peter and St. Mark, and published by Fabricius in his *Codex Apocryphus Nov. Testamenti*, are considered by the learned William Whiston,[1] and the equally learned John Ernest Grabe,[2] the former an Anglican minister, the latter originally a Lutheran, as authoritative as any of the books attributed to the apostles.

When the frenzied opposition exhibited by Protestants to all ecclesiastical authority, on their separation from the Catholic Church, had somewhat subsided, they began to perceive that Luther and his associates had gone too far in their attempts at remodelling that canon of Scripture which their fathers had followed ever since they became Christians. The deutero books of the New Testament were, therefore, everywhere gradually restored to their proper position. But those of the Old, though commonly admitted to be of some practical use, even if merely human, were excluded from the canon, but generally inserted by themselves between the Old and New Testament under the title of *Hagiographa*, or more frequently *Apocrypha*. Even this scant honor was too often grudged them. At the present time, though the annual production of English Protestant Bibles is simply immense, most Protestants whose vernacular is English live and die without ever having seen a copy containing these books. It was also soon perceived by those who adopted the principles of Luther that the versions of Scripture which their teachers had prepared for their use, whether through the ignorance or malice of the translators, misrepresented the original in many important particulars. In fact, this discovery was made while many of the translators were still alive, and not only led to bitter recriminations among those gentlemen themselves, but called forth vigorous protests from Protestants as well as Catholics.

[1] *Primitive Christianity.* [2] *Spicilegium.*

CHAPTER XXI.

The Canon of the Old Testament among the Protestants of the Sixteenth Century.—Their Versions of the Bible.

Regarding the estimate made by Martin Luther of several books of the Scripture, proto as well as deutero, the examination has been purposely restricted throughout to the voluntary statements submitted by Protestant witnesses. And it is now for each reader to constitute himself a court and say, whether and to what extent the said Luther has offended against the sacred majesty of God's own word. The next point to be discussed is the merits of the version prepared by Luther. This to be succeeded by a few remarks on some of the more pretentious versions, which followed fast and thick, as soon as Luther, in his own way, had prodigally given the Bible to the people. The subject is one in which both sides are supposed to have no little interest. It is but right, therefore, that on it Catholics as well as Protestants should be granted a hearing.

Hardly had Luther's translation seen the light, when it was condemned by his old antagonist Emser, a scholar not more distinguished for his devotion to Catholic principles than for his thorough knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. This accomplished critic declared that Luther had falsified the sacred text in almost every page, and that his version contained nearly fourteen hundred errors and corruptions. The stormy temper of the translator was aroused, and he hurled at his remorseless

censor the coarsest epithets in his foul vocalubary—"ass, blockhead, imp of Satan," etc.[1] "I dont care (screamed Luther) for the Popish asses, because they are unable to appreciate my labors."[2] Yet he afterwards corrected several of the errors which Emser and others had exposed.[3] It was bad enough to be thus severely handled by his Catholic adversaries. But, worse still, Luther's translation was condemned by the very men who were embarked in the same cause with himself. Martin Bucer, a zealous advocate of the new doctrines, did not hesitate to say that "Luther's mistakes in translating and explaining the Scriptures were manifest and not a few."[4] Zuinglius, another reformer, "publicly announced that Luther's version corrupted the word of God;" but Luther had his revenge in this instance, for "the Lutherans said the same of the version by Zuinglius.[5] Leusden's criticism was equally severe with that of Bucer and Zuinglius. "It swarmed (according to him) with errors." Aldigondius was still more sweeping in his condemnation of the new German Bible by Luther; "I will freely confess (these are his words) that among all the versions of all translators none has appeared to me to differ so much from the Hebrew verity as the version of Luther." A translation of Luther's Bible into Dutch was made soon after its appearance for the use of Protestants who spoke that language. But in 1618–19 this Dutch Bible was formally condemned by the Synod of Dort, which at the same time directed that a new version in Dutch should be made from the original. These facts have all been presented in Dixon's *Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures.*[6] Such was the verdict pronounced on the version of Luther by many who lived at the same time or soon after, and who had adopted either completely or par-

[1] Audin, *Life of Luther*, c. xxiv. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid. [5] Trevern's *Amicable Discuss.*, Vol i., p. 127 (note).
[6] Vol. I., pp. 209., 210.

tially the religious system of which Luther was the founder. A subsequent generation of German Protestants has confirmed that verdict, for in 1836 several Lutheran consistories expressed a wish for an entire revision of Luther's Bible.[1] In fact, the Old Testament, as contained in that Bible, has long since generally ceased to be understood by the ordinary German reader, while in its New Testament the Epistles have become obscure.[2] Luther's order and arrangement of the books in the New Testament seem to have been preserved, up to the present time, without, however, his prefaces, which are no longer found in current German Protestant Bibles, but have been several times published by themselves.[3]

Luther's Old Testament, barring its mistranslations, is strictly Jewish, not by any means such as ever had been current among Christians, though probably equal to any executed by the early reformers. But Luther's New Testament is neither Protestant nor Catholic. Certainly not Protestant, because he assigned an inferior position to four of its books, which Protestants generally place in the same rank with the rest. And assuredly not Catholic, not only for this reason, but because it abounds with so many and such grave corruptions as to render it a base German counterfeit of the original text.

These corruptions, at least many of them, cannot be imputed to the ignorance of the translator, though it is admitted, as we have seen, that Luther's knowledge of Greek as well as of Hebrew was not extensive; no, they are to be attributed to his own bad faith, and a wicked purpose of perverting the sense of the Scripture, in order to justify the errors he taught and the profligate career on which he had entered. For, though it was not until late in life that he commenced the study of He-

[1] Audin, *Life of Luther*, c. xxiv. [2] Ibid.

[3] Reuss, *Hist. of the Canon of the H. S.*, p. 338.

brew and Greek, his familiarity with these languages must have been such that, had he made an honest use of other means at hand, he could have executed a substantially correct version of the Bible, which all admit his is not. Thus it has been remarked[1] that he had recourse to the Vulgate in rendering difficult passages, that he translated the deutero books almost word for word from it, that he made use of an old German Catholic translation of the Vulgate, availed himself of the Latin interlinear translation of Sanctes Pagninus, and above all, that he derived great assistance from the learned commentaries of a converted Jew who lived in the fourteenth century, Nicholas de Lyra. It is for this reason that it has been commonly said, and as commonly admitted by critics, "Si Lyra non lyrasset, Lutherus non saltasset, vel Lutherus delirasset." It is a play upon the word "Lyra," intimating that, if Nicholas de Lyra had not written his commentaries, Luther would have cut a sorry figure as a translator, or would have made a fool of himself. That, as it was, he distinguished himself in the latter capacity, not many who have studied his life or read his writings will be disposed to deny.

With all the facilities which he possessed for writing a correct translation, Luther in many instances failed to produce a German equivalent for the texts that lay before him. He entered on his task not with the desire of providing his countrymen with a more faithful version of the Scriptures than they already possessed, but with the deliberate purpose of inoculating them with the virus of his own errors, by preparing for them a version in which those errors should be actually sanctioned by the word of God as misinterpreted by him. Hence he not unfrequently compelled the original, not only to speak a language which it neither expresses nor implies, but to convey a sense which it directly contradicts.

[1] Cornely, *Introd. in . Scrip.*, I., p. 490.

And all this in order to extort from that sacred original a proof, that the wicked doctrines which he undertook to defend were contained in the Scriptures. However, as those doctrines were antagonistic rather to the principles enunciated in the Christian than to any truth expressed in the Jewish Scriptures, Luther's perversions of the sacred text are especially flagrant, brazen, and barefaced in the New Testament.

To illustrate this, it is to be observed that Luther taught, that among other points on which the whole of Christendom East and West had been mistaken up to his time, were the observance of clerical celibacy and the belief that good works were necessary to salvation. He therefore undertook to prove, that in these as well as other matters of belief and practice, the Church was in error. And his proof brought conviction to all who believed that, in the base counterfeit he had substituted for the Bible, they found the word of God. Take for example his treatment of I. Cor. ix. 5, where the literal sense of the passage is, "Have we not the right to lead about a sister *woman*, as also the rest of the apostles?" etc. Luther found here a chance of proving one of his favorite doctrines, and he determined to mistranslate one word, and interpolate another; so he rendered it thus: "Have we not power to lead about a sister *for a wife*, like the rest of the apostles?" his object being to show that St. Paul and the other apostles all had *wives*, and consequently that clerical celibacy was condemned by apostolic practice. It was not enough for him to substitute *wife* for *woman*, the common meaning of *gune*, but he must represent St. Paul as claiming the right to consort with the sister in question, as with his own wife, whereas it is so clear from I. Cor. vii. 7 that St. Paul had no wife, that a Protestant commentator confesses that St. Paul was unmarried."[1] In most Protestant

[1] Adam Clark, on I. Cor. vii. 7.

translations the text which Luther falsified is mistranslated, but not so grossly as in Luther's Bible. In King James's version, of which Luther's perverted Bible was the basis, the clause in question is "a sister a *wife*. In the latest revision of that version, for it had to be often corrected, it is "a *wife* that is a believer." Possibly, when the next revision of the so called *Authorized Version* is made, *woman* will be as it ought to be substituted for *wife*. For *gune*, as just remarked, unless otherwise implied in the context, means simply a *woman*, whether married or single. Thus St. Peter, Luke xxii. 57,[1] accosts as *gunai*—woman—the *maid*—paidiske—who questioned him. And in the first twelve verses after I. Cor. xi. *gune* is translated woman no less than sixteen times.[2] Luther's translation, in this instance, though a shameless perversion of God's holy word, would have justified with most readers his relations with the escaped nun, had it not been for the vows of both. How many ecclesiastics, high and low, were led astray at the time by his pernicious example, and the vile principles he contrived to infuse into his German Bible and other writings! The obvious meaning of the passage is that Paul and Barnabas claimed the right of leading around with them "a sister woman" or pious matron, to minister to their wants, as the other apostles did, but declined to do so for fear of giving offence to the Gentiles among whom they labored. That it was probably not unusual[3] among the Jews for teachers to have in their company pious females for this very purpose, appears from the practice of Our Lord mentioned in Luke viii. 2, 3, where several women are named who ministered to Him of their substance. In fact, "sister woman" implies and can imply nothing else than a Christian woman devoted in some way to the service of religion, and so entitled to the

[1] Last Revision of *Authorized Version*.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Vide S. Jerome on Matt. xxviii.

name of *sister*, but not at all of *wife*, as there is nothing in the text that would occasion the suspicion that, even if married, there was any allusion to her conjugal duties. Indeed, such suspicion could occur only to a mind lost to all sense of shame and religion, like that of Martin Luther.

The same motive which induced Luther to pervert the sense of the text in I. Cor. ix. 5, controlled his pen when translating I. Timothy iii. 12, where the literal sense is, "Let deacons be husbands of one wife," which he makes, "Let deacons be *each* the husband of one wife." In the Greek original there is no such word as *each;* and *husbands*, not *husband*, is the correct reading. The object of S. Paul was to exclude from the ministry all who had been married more than once. But this did not coincide with Luther's idea of evangelical liberty. So, by falsifying the text, he makes St. Paul say, that none but a married man could be a deacon. That that is not at all the meaning of the Apostle is quite certain, although Protestant commentators generally, while substantially agreeing with the Catholic version, insist with Luther, that St. Paul directed that only men having each *one wife* should be promoted to the diaconate. So far as the possession of *one wife* is concerned, the same rule laid down in the text before us is found in I. Tim. iii. 2, as applicable to a bishop, whom "It behooveth . . . to be the husband of *one wife*," and in the Epistle to Titus, i. 6, according to which Titus was to ordain as priest any one who, besides other necessary qualifications, was "the husband of *one wife*." Now, in none of these passages is there any allusion to polygamy or polyandry, synchronous or consecutive. For among Christians such a state was never permitted. All the texts in question must therefore mean either what Catholics say they do, that no one was to be admitted to the Christian ministry who had married more than

once, or what is insisted on by Protestants following in the wake of Luther, and thus adopting his interpretation while rejecting his rendering of I. Tim. iii. 12, that St. Paul directed that no one who was not actually possessed of one wife should be ordained deacon, priest, or bishop. But if Protestants be right in thus explaining these texts, what is to be said of all those preachers high and low who have spent the whole or part of their ministerial career *without* a wife, despite the inspired injunction of Paul, as in their good-fellow-like way they call the author of the above texts? What is to be thought of the congregations which permitted those bachelor ministers to occupy pulpits, to baptize, and administer the Lord's supper? And what apology shall be urged for St. Paul, who, while a minister himself, required other ministers to take wives before their ordination, while he himself, as we have seen, remained "unmarried"? Why did he not observe the commandment he gave to others? If a poor deacon must, before being promoted, be necessarily provided with a wife, it is hard to see why, as the case may turn out, an apostle should not be burthened with the same responsibility or blessed with the same luxury. Nothing more is needed to expose the absurdity of the conclusion, which Luther and all his followers have drawn from the texts of St. Paul. It follows that the Catholic interpretation of those texts is the only one consistent with evangelical principles, with apostolic usage, and with primitive Christian practice. In the Church a ONCE married man can, if otherwise qualified, be ordained sub-deacon, deacon, and priest, on condition that his wife, if living, consents and makes a vow of chastity, and furthermore enters a religious order, in case he is consecrated bishop.

Look again at I. Tim. iii. 11, and see with what brazen impudence Luther, in order to persuade his simple German readers that Christian ministers should

have wives, put into the mouth of St. Paul words which that Apostle never uttered. The chapter commences with a reference to the duties of a bishop. Next the qualifications of deacons are explained, and while discussing this subject, St. Paul, as literally interpreted, remarks, "women in like manner chaste," etc. This Luther distorts, "Like themselves *their wives* shall be," etc., as if it was not of women generally, or the religious class of their sex, that the Apostle was speaking, as the text implies, but of the deacons' *wives*. To their shame be it said, that King James's translators substantially adopted Luther's rendering, even while they knew it was a forgery; for they placed in italics the words conveying Luther's false interpretation, thus confessing that the German translator had added to the text *words* which it did not contain, yet slavishly, shall we say impiously, giving currency in their English version to the sense expressed by those words. Their rendering is, "Even so must *their wives* be." etc. The latest revisers of that version, however, ashamed as they well might be of the wilful perversion perpetrated in this instance by the authors of that version, have correctly restored the sense of the original by thus translating the text, "women in like manner."

These examples will show how blasphemously Luther treated the Scripture, in order to support his views regarding clerical celibacy. A few references will convince the reader that Luther endeavored by the same means to establish the uselessness of good works, and the absolute sufficiency of faith for eternal salvation.

In Romans iii. 28 we read, as the original has it: "For we account a man to be justified by faith without the works of the law." Luther's translation here is: "Hence we hold that a man becomes righteous without the works of the law, *alone* through faith." The word *alone* is not in the original, but is adroitly slipped into the

passage, in order to persuade the reader that to be saved faith *alone* is required. There must therefore still be a chance for Lucifer. Again, in Romans iv. 6, St. Paul writes: "As David also termeth the blessedness of a man to whom God reputeth justice without works." Luther's version of the text is: "As also David saith, that happiness is that man's *alone*, to whom God reputeth justice without works." Here the word *alone* is again employed to pervert the Apostle's meaning. In rendering these texts the authors of the English Protestant version recoiled from imitating the impiety of Luther. Hence the reader of that version does not find the word *alone* or anything like it in the texts just cited. But Luther, by a dexterous though sacrilegious use of such a handy word, hoped to convince his readers that he had the authority of St. Paul for teaching that "no sin, however great, except unbelief, can damn a man."[1] That he to a certain extent succeeded is proved by the immoral lives of those, who adopted the code of ethics which he instituted. It was useless to reason or remonstrate with such a man. When reminded that he had flagrantly corrupted the sacred text by interpolating the word *alone*, he obstinately refused to make the necessary correction, saying: "So I will, so I command; let my will be instead of reason;" and concluded thus: "The word *alone* must remain in my New Testament; although all the Papists seem mad, they shall not take it from thence; it grieves me that I did not add also these two other words, *without all works of all laws*." But enough has been said about Luther's views regarding the canon, and the use he has made of its contents.

CALVIN'S version.—This was a French translation of the Bible and was printed in 1534. It was written by Peter Olivetan, whose knowledge of French as well as of Hebrew and Greek was imperfect. But he received

[1] Luther's treatise *de Capt. Babyl.*—See Hallam, *Lit. of Eur.*, P. I., 305, note.

assistance from Calvin, of whom he was a relative, and to whom his translation, whatever its merits, may be ascribed. What these merits were may be inferred from the criticism of Dumoulin, a learned French Calvinistic minister, who says that Calvin does violence to the letter of the Gospel, which he has changed, making also additions of his own. It appears, besides, that the ministers of Geneva believed themselves obliged to make an exact version, but James I. of England declared in the conference of Hampton Court that of all the versions it was the most wicked and the most unfaithful. So wrote Trevern, Bishop of Strasburg, in 1817. [1]

Œcolampadius and the divines of Basle, as we are told by the writer just cited, [2] made another version, which, according to the famous Beza, was impious in many parts. But it appears that the divines of Basle said the same of a similar production by Beza. For at the time the tongue or pen of every true reformer was never idle, whether it was the Bible that was to be parodied, or some other true reformer that was to be abused.

This Theodore Beza was the successor of Calvin at Geneva, and the author of a Latin translation of the New Testament, printed in 1556. Critics, Protestant as well as Catholic, are unsparing in their condemnation of the work. Dumoulin charges the author with changing in it the text of Scripture. [3] The Anglican bishop Walton, a disinterested witness, says of it: "There are not wanting those who judge that the author was too bold, while too often without necessity he recedes from the common reading, and, relying on the authority of one or no manuscript, exercises dictatorial power by conjectural changes and arbitrary interpolations of the sacred text." [4] MacKnight, a Scotch Presbyterian minister, who died in 1800, candidly admits that Beza "mistrans-

[1] *Amicable Discussion*, Vol. i., 127, note. [2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid. [4] *Proleg.* iv. 15.

lated a number of texts, for the purpose, as it would seem, of establishing his peculiar doctrines and of confuting his opponents. . . . Farther, by omitting some of the original words, and by adding others, he hath in his translation perverted, or at least darkened, some passages; so that, to speak impartially, his translation is neither literal nor faithful nor perspicuous." Beza as a translator has since been conclusively proved by a learned writer [1] in the *American Catholic Quarterly* [2] to have been simply "a perverter of God's Word." Indeed, MacKnight's criticism must have already convinced many a Protestant that the successor of Calvin had well earned the title conferred on him by the American Reviewer; unfortunately, it is only recently that his right to that title has been generally admitted. For MacKnight, after indignantly denouncing his impious treatment of the Scriptures, adds: "Nevertheless Beza, having great fame, both as a linguist and a divine, the learned men who afterwards translated the New Testament for the use of the reformed churches were too much swayed by his opinions." [3] This last remark applies particularly to the writers of those translations which were placed in the hands of the Protestants in Great Britain and its colonies. For these translations were based on the same vicious principles, which have wrung from Protestant critics an unwilling condemnation of the version by Beza. Wittenberg furnished a model for all Protestant bibles in Northern Europe, and along with Geneva enabled the reformers in Great Britain to provide their country with versions of the Scriptures adapted to the religious principles recently introduced there. For at the time it was usual with those outside the Church, as it still is the custom of that class,

[1] Rt. Rev. Dr. Corcoran. [2] Vol. IV., No. 15; Vol. V., No. 20.

[3] *Preface to a Translation of the Apostolical Epistles.*—See also Dixon, *A Gen. Introd. to the S. Scrip.*, I., p. 208.

to regulate the Bible by their creed, instead of shaping their creed by the Bible. Now, as the creed of no Protestant country ever was, or is now, a constant quantity, the Protestant Bible, wherever it has appeared or whatever its language, has undergone more changes than any book that was ever written. But it is time to turn our attention to some of the attempts made by the English reformers to supply their followers with what they called the word of God, especially as the Protestant Bibles described in the preceding remarks will enable the reader to form a fair estimate of the other versions prepared by the reformers in the continent of Europe.

All the English Protestant versions contained without any distinction the deutero books of the New Testament, which are generally designated the *Antilegomena* by Protestant writers. It was not so, however, with the deutero books of the Old Testament. These, when inserted in the same volume with the other books, were commonly assigned such a position, or given such a title, as implied that they were of inferior authority. In fact, this arrangement, when the books in question were not absolutely excluded from the volume supposed to contain the Holy Scriptures, was adopted in all Protestant translations. Nor need this be a matter of surprise. For Professor Smith [1] confesses that "the reformers and their successors, up to the time when all Protestant versions were fixed, were for all purposes of learning in the hands of Rabbins." But what are we to think of versions with which the enemies of Christ and of the Christian religion had anything to do?

TYNDALE'S BIBLE.—William Tyndale, an apostate priest, was the first to attempt an English Protestant translation. Compelled to abandon England, he fled to the Continent. And no sooner had he landed at Hamburg than he hastened to greet Luther at Wittenberg. [2]

[1] *The O. T. in the Jewish Church*, p. 44. [2] Encycl. Britt., *English Bible.*

There he probably commenced his translation of the New Testament. And in it he adopted Luther's prefaces to the several books, as well as many of Luther's annotations. The translation was printed at Cologne, in 1526, and appeared the same year in England. He also translated the Five Books of Moses, Jonas, and, according to some, other parts of the Old Testament, as far as the end of Paralipomena. Hallam,[2] after observing that Luther's translation "is more renowned for the purity of its German idiom than for its adherence to the original text," admits that it was "from this translation, however, and from the Latin Vulgate, the English one of Tyndale.... is avowedly taken." His reason for saying so being that Tyndale was ignorant of Hebrew, and had but a slight, if any, knowledge of Greek. Sir Thomas More, in a notice of Tyndale's translation, says that in it such old Christian words as *church*, *priest*, *anointing*, *consecrating*, *sacraments*, *ceremonies*, were changed into *congregation*, *seniors*, *smearing*, *charming*, *ceremonies*, *witchcraft*.[3] It will thus be perceived that Tyndale's vocabulary as a translator differed altogether, not only from that of the Catholic versions current in England at the time, but from that of the Protestant version used there at present. Permitted by God to take part in preparing the way for Puritanism, he therefore concluded that the most effectual way to succeed in that unholy mission was not only to corrupt the Bible of his countrymen, but to cheat them out of that form of speech which, so long as they retained, they would probably have remained Catholics. Had he been spared to complete his version of the Old Testament, it can hardly be doubted,that its deutero books would have been treated by him with as little consideration as they received from his friend and adviser at Wittenberg.

[1] Encycl. Britt., *English Bible*. [2] *Literat. of Europe*, Part I., p. 380.
[3] Milner's *Answer to Grier's Reply* (Ward's *Errata*).

COVERDALE'S BIBLE.—Miles Coverdale, like Luther an apostate Augustinian friar, and afterwards for a few years Anglican bishop of Exeter under Edward VI., translated the entire Bible into English. It was published in 1536, and was the first to receive royal authority. The defects of Tyndale's Bible, besides its incompleteness, had probably been found to be such that the reformers demanded another more in accordance with the original text, perhaps with their own motley belief. The title of Coverdale's Bible was "Biblia. The Bible, that is, the Holy Scripture of the Olde and New Testament, faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn into Englishe, MDXXXV." Hallam [1] has therefore very truthfully remarked, that Coverdale's Bible "is avowedly taken" from Luther's translation and the Latin Vulgate. Dr. Davidson, [2] in an article on *Versions*, says of Coverdale's Bible that, "although the author had the benefit of Tyndale's, his work must be considered inferior. In addition to the culpable obsequiousness of Coverdale, he was not so well skilled in the original languages of the Scriptures, and had therefore to rely on the German and Latin." It was therefore from bad to worse, when English Protestants betook themselves for a rule of faith from Tyndale's Bible to Coverdale's. In the latter the deutero books of the Old Testament were divided from the proto and printed separately, with the exception of Baruch, [3] which was allowed to retain its place, until another edition appeared in 1550, when it was ranked among the deutero. These books were called by Coverdale in his Bible "The Volume of the Book called the Hagiographa."

MATTHEW'S BIBLE,—so called probably because a person of that name had most to do in its preparation, was published in 1537. It was simply a revision of Tyn-

[1] *Literature of Europe*, Part I., p. 380.

[2] Kitto's Cycl., II., 918.

[3] Ibid., I., 556.

dale's as far as the latter went, the remainder of the Old Testament having been translated by John Rogers, *alias* Matthew, with perhaps some assistance from Coverdale's. In it the deutero books of the Old Testament were separated from the others, and entitled, "The volume of the book called Hagiographa." It contains Olivetan's preface in Calvin's version, wherein the Old Testament deutero books are referred to rather disrespectfully.

TAVERNER'S BIBLE,—the work of Richard Taverner, was published in 1539. It was nothing more than the Matthew Bible corrected.

CRANMER'S BIBLE,—so named because published, in 1539, under the auspices of the notorious Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, went through several editions, each, like all the preceding Bibles, proving by its appearance that, notwithstanding all that had been done to satisfy the cravings of British Protestants for the Scriptures, England had not yet secured the pure word of God. Indeed, this was admitted by the most learned Protestants in the country at the time. In Cranmer's Bible the Olivetan preface was retained, and "the volume of the book called Hagiographa" prefixed to the collection of Old Testament deutero books. But in the edition of 1549 *Apocrypha* was substituted for *Hagiographa*. Cranmer's Bible is no more than the translation of Tyndale and Rogers [1] revised, with a prologue by Cranmer. On account of its size it was also called the Great Bible. The Geneva or *Breeches* Bible, as it is sometimes called, because in Gen. iii. 7 the translator had substituted *breeches* for *apron*, was printed in 1560, at Geneva, and is the work of William Whittingham, Antony Gibby, and Thomas Sampson, all fugitive reformers. In it the deutero books of the Old Testament are printed separately, with a preface, in which they are treated with much

[1] Allibone's *Dictionary of Authors*.

reverence, though not considered sufficiently authoritative to establish any point of Christian doctrine. In the parallel passages which the margin of this translation contains, references are even made to the deutero books. The Geneva Bible was not an original work but a revision of the Great Bible.[1]

THE BISHOPS' BIBLE,—otherwise called Parker's, was published in 1568, under the superintendence of Matthew Parker, Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury. There were fifteen translators employed upon it, and eight of them being bishops, it was called the Bishops' Bible. It, too, was a revision of the Great Bible, as appears by one of the rules laid down for the guidance of the translators,[2] who, however, were to consult the Hebrew and Greek originals. The Olivetan preface was omitted in the Bishops' Bible. But the deutero books of the Old Testament, or, as they were then generally designated, the *Apocrypha*, appeared therein by themselves under that title, being thus, as in all other English Protestant Bibles, excluded from what the reformers considered the pure word of God.

[1] Encycl. Britt., Blunt on *Eng. Bible.* [2] Ibid.

CHAPTER XXII.

The English Protestant Bible.

All these English translations, revisions, and editions having been made like those by the continental reformers for the purpose of extorting from the Bible a reason, or at least an apology, for the violent suppression of the religion which the people of England had all along professed, they simply reflected the opinions of their authors, not the doctrines which God had revealed in the Divine Scriptures. Brought out one after another in rapid succession, these counterfeit copies of the Word of God unsettled the minds of their readers, who, as instructed by their teachers, supposed themselves authorized to interpret the Scriptures each one for himself; and believing that the book placed in their hands contained the very words, or at least the exact doctrines, which the Holy Ghost had communicated to mankind, they organized themselves into innumerable conflicting sects, which soon developed into mutually hostile factions, whose struggles for supremacy hardly ceased, even when altar and throne had been overturned, and a Church established with a creed so comprehensive, yet so indefinite, as to embrace, so far as that was possible, all existing shades of Protestant belief.

There were, however, not wanting men entitled to a respectful hearing, by their learning and social position, who protested vehemently against the profanation and corruption of the sacred text by such unscrupulous

translators as the Tyndales, Coverdales, etc., of the time. Among those who so protested were ministers of the gospel, statesmen, and university professors, all staunch advocates of the reformation. Thus a number of petitioners who addressed "his most excellent majesty, King James I.," on the subject, complained "that our translation of the Psalms, comprised in our Book of Common Prayer, doth, in addition, subtraction, and alteration, differ from the truth of the Hebrew in at least two hundred places." The ministers of Lincoln Diocese also urged on the royal attention, while referring to the Protestant Bible then in use, that it "is a translation that takes away from the text, that adds to the text, and that, sometimes, to the changing or obscuring of the meaning of the Holy Ghost;" they denounced it still further as "a translation which is absurd and senseless, perverting in many places the meaning of the Holy Ghost." Hugh Broughton, a minister, the most accomplished Hebrew scholar of his time and thoroughly versed in Rabbinical learning, in his advertisements of corruptions, tells the Anglican bishops "that their public translation of Scriptures into English is such, that it perverts the text of the Old Testament in eight hundred and forty eight places, and that it causes millions of millions to reject the New Testament, and to run to eternal flames." King James, as he is reported to have said, had surely good reason to complain "that he could never see a Bible well translated into English." These statements, and many more of the same character, with the proper references, will be found in Ward's *Errata*. "Corrupt," "absurd," "senseless," "contrary," and "perverting the meaning of the Holy Ghost" are the words used by learned Protestant writers to characterize the Protestant translations of the Bible prepared for the use of the English people.

King James's Bible.—Convinced that so far no modern

translation deserving that name had been made of the Scriptures, King James I. directed that a new version from the original languages of the Bible should be written, and care taken to correct the corruptions which previous English translators had introduced into the text. Forty-seven learned men were selected for the purpose, and rules laid down for their guidance by the king. Four or five years were spent by them on the task. And the New, or, as it is often called, the authorized version, or King James's Bible—the same having been ever since used by all English speaking Protestants—was published in 1611. In it, as already stated, the deutero books of the Old Testament were separated from the others, and under the title of *Apocrypha* appended to that part of the Bible. At present the "authorized" version is usually published without them. Of this version Dr. Davidson, often cited in the present work, said in 1845: "It need scarcely be stated that King James's translators have failed to apprehend the true meaning in many passages. Of the merit attaching to their version a considerable share belongs to Tyndale. Parker's Bible was the professed basis, and that was a revision of Cranmer's. Cranmer's Bible was a revision of Matthew's, or, in other words, of Tyndale's. Thus King James's translation resolves itself, in no small measure, into Tyndale's." [1]

But long before this criticism appeared it had been conclusively shown that King James's translators not only "failed to apprehend the true meaning in many passages," but that they wilfully, shamelessly, and criminally mistranslated almost innumerable texts, with the obvious intention of persuading their readers that the Protestant religion was sanctioned and the Catholic religion condemned by the Bible. For, having been selected on account of their knowledge of the languages in which

[1] Kittos *Cycl.*, Vol. II., p. 919.

the Bible was originally written, it is not to be supposed that "they failed to apprehend the true meaning" of the text in passages which the merest tyro in those languages, at least with the assistance of the Vulgate and other early versions, could easily interpret. Yet there are many such passages which those learned linguists mistranslated, and generally in a sense favorable to their own religious belief, and condemnatory of certain doctrines taught by the Catholic Church. Let any unprejudiced reader consult Ward's *Errata of the Protestant Bible*, and he will be convinced that in these remarks the faults, of which King James's translators were guilty, have not been exaggerated. And though many of the falsifications which Ward in 1688 exposed to public reprobation had, as he admitted, been corrected before that, and others have been corrected since, quite a number still remain to prove that the men, who made the last English Protestant version of the Bible, basely and criminally abused the trust reposed in them, and imposed on all English speaking Protestants throughout the world what is in many respects nothing but a mendacious parody of God's holy word. That it is such can be very easily shown. But before citing a few out of the many instances in which these translators wilfully perverted the meaning of the text before them; in order to convince all into whose hands their version might fall, that Protestantism was the religion of the Bible, and Catholicity a gross superstition condemned by the Bible; we must say a word or two regarding the men, whose labors on the Bible were for many ages to regulate in a great measure the religious views of Protestants, wherever the English language should be spoken.

The translators consisted mainly of two factions bitterly opposed to each other, but ready for the time being to forget their differences and unite for the success of any scheme contrived for the extermination of what they re-

garded the common enemy, Popery, as they designated the Catholic religion. These two factions were Anglicans and Puritans, or Episcopalians and Calvinists, the former the defenders and the latter the opponents of prelacy. The Anglicans professed a heresy which had its origin in England; the Puritans advocated another, which had been imported from Geneva. Their version was the outgrowth of all the Protestant Bibles which had circulated in England since the time of Tyndale, whose Bible served as a basis for it, as it had done for all the rest. But the authors of King James's version had a more difficult task to perform than had fallen to the lot of those who had preceded them in the same field of labor. The latter wrote each in the interest of one party; the former had to consult the prejudices not only of two main factions, but of the several cliques belonging to each of these. Their Bible, therefore, was a compromise, while it retained the anti-Catholic tone peculiar to all those Bibles of which it was a development.

These Bibles, one and all, had been prepared for the purpose of rendering the doctrines and practices of the Church, her worship and her ministers, odious to the people of England. And special care had been taken by their authors to so distort the meaning of the original wherever it was possible, that the simple reader must necessarily believe, or at least suspect, that the faith of Catholics either could not be established by the Scripture or was condemned by it. These perversions of the truth, as contained in the Bible, passed into King James's version; and they remain there, many of them, to this day; and may be found even in the latest revision which has been made of that version. From the first, the purpose of Tyndale, Coverdale, and all who followed in their wake, was to twist text after text in order to show that Catholics were idolaters. Even the royal stripling Edward VI., prompted by his trainer, disdained not to

take part in the unholy and uncharitable work; for he collected all the texts he could find against idols, and in an essay on the subject expressed his astonishment "that so many people have dared to commit *idolatry by making and adoring images.*"[1] What wonder that a proclamation was issued at the time directing that all images be destroyed?[2]

With every government, from that of Henry VIII. down to the present century (that of Mary excepted), against them, with the popular Bible against them, and with public feeling, the consequence of these two causes, against them, need we be surprised at the hue and cry of which Catholics have been the object for so many ages in England. Their enemies of all sects and parties then argued against them after this fashion—a fashion as simple as it was successful.

> Idolaters are not to be tolerated.
> But Catholics are idolaters.
> Therefore Catholics are not to be tolerated.

To most people the Major proposition would appear self-evident. In fact, it is plainly laid down in Deut. xiii. 6–17. The Minor was demonstrated by innumerable texts in the Protestant (not Jewish) Bible, like Ex. xx. 4, Lev. xxxvi. 1, Deut. xxvii. 15, where it is forbidden by God to make graven and molten *images*, and the maker of such *images* is cursed. Now Catholics confessedly not only make, but *worship* such *images*, and even profess that the *worship* of *images*, or, to use their own words, the *cultus imaginum*, is a part of their religion. It follows therefore by all the rules of logic that Catholics are idolaters, and as such are to be punished as directed in Deut. xiii., or at least, if they do not conform to the worship established by act of Parliament, that they should be exterminated, as under Henry VIII., Edward VI., Queen Elizabeth, Cromwell, etc., by fines, confisca-

[1] Bossuet's *Variations*, Vol. i., p. 264. 313

[2] Lingard, *Hist. of England*, Vol. v., p. 129

tion, exile, imprisonment, the gibbet, and the headsman's axe.

While wrestling with this syllogism, the Catholics of the time may or may not have discussed the Major proposition; at all events, in the issue forced upon them it was immaterial. But they stoutly and successfully denied the Minor, as they do still. First, because the word *worship* (cultus), though sometimes improperly used to express the honor due to God, is very commonly employed to signify the respect paid to a creature. Thus in the Anglican marriage service the bridegroom says to his bride, "with my body I thee *worship*." And the civil magistrate is addressed in England with the word "your *worship*" or "Right *worshipful*," this last sign of respect being sometimes paid even to women of exalted rank. It is in this sense that the word *worship* is used, when its object is holy images or God's saints, as the Council of Trent,[1] the highest authority in the Catholic Church, has taught. Second, because, to remove all ambiguity on the subject, our theologians distinguish three kinds of *worship*:—*Latria*, the divine worship due to God alone, and of which no mere creature is worthy. To offer this worship to any creature is *idolatry* (Latria of idols). *Dulia*, that inferior worship offered to a creature, as the saints, their relics or images, or any person, on account of his virtues, office, etc. It was this which Josue offered to the angel.[2] And *Hyperdulia*, a higher kind of that *dulia* with which the saints are honored, and to which the Mother of God as the holiest of all creatures is alone entitled. Catholics are therefore not idolaters because they worship holy images; since, while doing so, it is not *latria but dulia* they offer to those objects. To kiss the Bible or swear by it is *dulia*, and what Protestant scruples to worship God's holy word in this way, or would not treat as an insult

[1] Sessio xxv. [2] Josue v. 14.

or a slander the charge that his act is idolatry? Besides, the veneration paid by Catholics to holy images is offered to God as its ultimate object—God, without whom nothing would be holy or worthy of worship.—Third, Catholics deny the Minor proposition, because it is not alone infamously slanderous, but flagrantly blasphemous; for it insults the Holy Ghost, the author of the Sacred Scriptures, as well as calumniates Catholics themselves. This is retorting the argument with a vengeance. But the proof is at hand, and is now submitted, as the first instance in which King James's translators, following the bad example of Tyndale and Co., perverted the meaning of the Bible to establish a falsehood and perpetuate a calumny.

No I.—In Exod. xx. 4, xxxi. 4, Lev. xix. 4, xxvi. 1, Deut. xxvii. 15, and dozens of other places, the royal translators interpolated or retained *image* or *images*, which they knew right well was not in the original. For instance, the original of the verse last named is, as literally rendered, "Cursed is the man who makes a *graven* or a *molten*—these two words expressing exactly and respectively the two Hebrew words *pesel* and *massecah*, and being correctly represented in the Septuagint by *glupton* and *choneuton*, and in the Vulgate by *sculptile* and *conflatile*. It is unnecessary to say, that the authors of the Septuagint, at least, were in a position to ascertain the sense of the original far better than it was possible for the Anglican translators to do. The former, living in the third century before Christ, had the use of much older and more varied manuscripts. They were all Jews, and all, of course, competent Hebrew scholars, while the latter, whatever their knowledge of Hebrew, were restricted to a class of manuscripts modified after a Rabbinical archetype, which can be traced no further back than the first century,[1] the oldest of said manuscripts being

[1] Smith, *The Old Test. in the Jewish Church*, pp. 74, 75.

dated A. D. 916, [1] and all of them originating with and modified by the Masoretic doctors.

Well would it have been for the credit of our Anglican translators had they in the texts referred to, and indeed in many others, followed the Greek and Latin versions, and left the words *sculptile* and *conflatile* just as they found them, or if not, anglicized them by *sculpture* and *casting*, terms quite intelligible to English readers. No doubt they could and should have adopted the "*a graven or a molten thing*" of the Douay Bible, or, if they disdained to copy the rendering of Catholic scholars, though that rendering reproduced exactly in English what was expressed in the Hebrew, they might have written "a graven or a molten *figure*, or *emblem*, or *object*, or *representation*. But so fastidious were they in the choice of words whenever the text referred to idolatry, that in the whole range of the English language they could find but one adapted to their taste. No one can blame them for endeavoring to fill the hiatus. Catholics had already filled it with "thing," a word which left the sense of the original undecided, just as it had been left by the inspired writer. For a translator has no right to commit a writer, whose work he undertakes to reproduce in another language, to an idea which that writer has not expressed. And this rule is to be closely followed, indeed, admits of no exception, when a translator assumes the duty of making known to others what God has written in a language not understood by them.

But our Protestant translators of the Hebrew Bible thought otherwise, at least they acted otherwise. For they gave their readers to understand that the inspired writer had written *image*, where he had written nothing of the kind, although he had in his language a good equivalent. Thus, when wishing to express the idea

[1] *Pref. to last Rev. of King James's Bible*, note.

conveyed by image, he had already written *tselem*.[1] So, although they had in their own language several synonymous words, they rejected them all for *image*, that being the only one by which, with the aid of a falsified text, they hoped to convict of idolatry the Catholics, on account of the veneration these cherished for sacred *images*. And every time the translators inserted that word, where another would have served as well and far better; and where the inspired penman had not written it, they knew right well that the covering of the tabernacle contained "interwoven *images of cherubim*;" and that its entrance "was closed by a splendid curtain, in which *figures* were woven," while "*figures* of *cherubim* were woven in the curtain which separated the sanctuary from the holy of holies;"[2] and that over the ark of the covenant there "were two cherubim."[3] They knew, too, that God had directed that a brazen serpent[4] should be erected, at the sight of which *image* those bitten by serpents were to be cured. They were also well aware that in God's holy temple at Jerusalem, besides the immense *images* of the two cherubim over the ark, there were several other such *images*, and even *images* of oxen, lions, etc.[5] Of all this the English Protestant translators of the Bible were fully cognizant. Yet, wherever they met with the Hebrew equivalent for *graven* and *molten* in passages forbidding the use of such material for idolatrous purposes, they take care to add the word *image*—no doubt presuming, that their simple readers; unable to perceive that, while idolatrous *images* were forbidden in one part of the Bible, *images* connected with the worship of the true God were permitted in another; and, perhaps incapable, without previous instruction, of distinguishing between the two classes of *images*, would

[1] Gen. i. 26. See A Lapide's Com.

[2] Kitto's *Cycl.* (Tabernacle).

[3] Ibid. Ex. xxxvii. 7. 317

[4] Num. xxi. 9.

[5] III. Kings vi. vii.

rise from the perusal of the first part of the Bible with the conviction that the use of *images* for any purpose whatever and under all possible circumstances was simply idolatry, and that the class of so-called Christians known as Catholics, but known also as worshippers of *images*, were after all nothing but idolaters. That conviction, in fact, was actually produced, and has been long cherished by a large class of Protestants. Indeed, it may be doubted whether it has been universally discarded by them. At all events, its propagation, if not its origin, is to be placed to the credit of the men who wrote that English version, which has circulated among Protestants since the beginning of the seventeenth century.

An apologist might plead in behalf of those men their early training, the first lesson of which inculcated the belief that Catholic worship was rank idolatry; the state of public opinion, according to which, so far as Catholics were concerned, persecution was at worst but an act of stern justice, and toleration an unmerited and impolitic privilege; and the general circulation of false and anti-Catholic Bibles, from whose text it would not have been safe for the translators to have deviated very much.

To all this there is a ready and satisfactory answer. No combination of circumstances can excuse, much less justify, a wilful and systematic misrepresentation of what is contained in the holy Scriptures. And this is the offence with which King James's translators have been charged all along, ever since their Bible was published—a serious offence, no matter from what quarter it proceeds, but particularly so when committed by a prominent body of Christian ministers. That any of them ever formally plead guilty to this grave charge does not appear. But it is certain that the official chiefs in the Anglican communion, those charged with the care of the Anglican version, have more than once and in

several instances corrected in it errors which were the result not only of human frailty but of bad faith. For to nothing but bad faith can be attributed the insertion, without any reason or authority, of the particular word *image* in almost every passage prohibiting the practice of idolatry. Yet all such passages remain to this day (with one exception, to be immediately indicated) just as the translators left them, as if those who make use of this version, and who alone can make the necessary corrections, were determined to retain as long as possible the dishonest advantage resulting from a standing and glaring perversion of the word of God. Now it was evident to the authors of said versions, as it is evident to every reader of the original or of any of the ancient versions of that original, that it was not a mere *image*, however or of whatever made, that was forbidden by God, but any *thing* or *object* whatever, however made or fashioned, or "the likeness of any *thing* that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath," or "of those things that are in the waters under the earth,"[2] if that *thing* or *things*, though a *stock* or a *stone*, were made use of to be adored—the use of such *thing* or *things*, be it any image or likeness whatever, being permitted when not employed for idolatrous purposes. That there might be no mistake about the matter, the Scriptures informed the Anglican translators, as they informed all who read them, that Moses and Solomon, inspired by God, made no scruple of introducing, the one into the tabernacle, the other into the temple, many *things* interdicted in Ex. xx., thus indicating that the use of such things, though forbidden as objects of idolatry, was approved by God when employed as adjuncts of his own religion. This evident truth is further confirmed by the fact that *eidolon* (idol) is sometimes[3] used as an equivalent for *graven* and *molten* by the LXX, who certain-

[1] Infra p 322. [2] Exod. xx. 4. 5. [3] Ibid.; Is. xxx. 22.

ly understood what was implied in the corresponding Hebrew words much better than the Anglican translators, who had the Greek interpretation before them, and on whom this broad hint of these old Alexandrian Jews should not have been lost, for clearly they thus meant to remind all future interpreters, whether royal or plebeian, that not alone *images*, but all *things* whatsoever were forbidden, only, however, when they were used as idols. But the royal translators were not disposed to listen to reason, justice, or truth. The old Church, which they had deserted to share in the plunder which followed her suppression, or to indulge propensities on which she imposed restraint, still bleeding as she was from the cruel wounds inflicted by the fangs of the tigress Elizabeth, must be maligned. And a travesty of the Bible is prepared, as the most effectual means of accomplishing that iniquitous purpose. Therefore, although it is forbidden to adore a *stick* or a *stone*, sculptured or not, a *lump* of native ore, or any mass of mineral, wrought or unwrought, cast or uncast, or any object in heaven, or earth, or under the earth, it is only, say the English interpreters in their spurious Bible, an *image* that is forbidden; their wicked purpose being to convict the down-trodden Catholics of idolatry, by the testimony of what they proposed as the pure word of God; because images were found in churches devoted to Catholic worship, just as they were found on the tabernacle erected by Moses and in the temple built by Solomon.

CHAPTER XXIII.

The English Protestant Bible, Continued.

When in 1870 it was resolved, at the convocation of Canterbury, to undertake a new revision of King James's Bible, as a matter urgently demanded by those many errors, offensive to Christian piety which, whether wilful or not, notwithstanding many previous revisions, still made that production, as all intelligent readers knew, not an English version but an Anglican mistranslation of the Bible: it was hoped that many, and,at least,the most glaring perversions,which polluted its pages, would be removed; and that after a period of nearly three centuries Anglican ministers would at last provide English speaking Protestants with a Bible that would at all events convey the substantial sense of the original. The revisers must have been well aware, that the translators, swayed by their dogmatic prejudices, had throughout appended to *graven* and *molten* the word *image*, for no other purpose than to confirm their readers in the absurd and malignant belief that Catholics were idolaters. This slander, and the unholy attempt to substantiate it by perverting the word of God, had been exposed again and again by competent critics, who had reviewed the work of the translators. Yet the revisers, as if loath to surrender an advantage obtained by such infamous and impious means, seem to have allowed all the passages prostituted to a purpose so vile and dishonorable to remain as they found them, with one solitary exception, which occurs in Lev. xxvi. 1. That verse in

the original contains the word *Matzebah*—*Stelen* in Greek, *Titulos* in Latin,—the meaning of all these words being in plain English *column* or *pillar*. But the translators had rendered it *a standing image*, and in their version it remains so to this day, *a standing image* of their malignity against the Catholic Church and of the fraud practised by them on all whom they persuaded to receive their version as the Bible. The revisers in this instance, however,—why? it is hard to say,—thought fit to employ the correct English word, and therefore substituted for the base counterfeit issued from the royal mint the genuine equivalent of the Hebrew. So that in the new revision of the Protestant Old Testament a Protestant will now read *pillar* instead of *standing image* as before. But why did not the revisers do in every other case of the kind what they did in this? Or did they retain everywhere else the foisted word *image*, in order that such of their readers as were unable to consult the original text in the Hebrew Bible, or some of the ancient versions thereof, might still be persuaded by the omission of the revisers to correct the cognate falsifications, that the charge of idolatry had been proved against the Catholic Church, as almost all the texts cited by Protestants for the purpose have been left as they stood by a body of critics selected from among the foremost Protestant scholars in Great Britain and the United States, for the purpose of correcting all mistakes in the English Protestant Bible.

The authors of the English Protestant version have in several passages mistranslated the word *Sheol*, by rendering it sometimes *grave*, sometimes *pit*, although at other times *hell*.[1] The LXX translate it *Hades*, and the Vulgate *Infernus*—these words generally meaning hell, or the abode of departed spirits not in heaven; although in the Scriptures the Hebrew, as well as the Greek and Latin

[1] *Pref. to Revision of O. T.*

word, has often been taken to signify grave or death. But the meaning of the Hebrew, as well as of the other two words, may be generally inferred with absolute certainty from the context. This is particularly the case in the first passage where *Sheol* occurs, namely, Gen. xxxvii. 35. Thus Jacob, being shown the bloody coat of Joseph, exclaims in his grief: "An evil wild beast hath eaten him, a beast hath devoured Joseph. . . . I will go down to my son into *Sheol* (hell), mourning." Jacob supposed that Joseph was dead, and his body eaten by some wild beast. All the circumstances prove, that when the former said he would "go down to" the latter "into *Sheol*" he must have meant *hell*. For, by going to Joseph, he could not have meant Joseph's body, then (if not already digested) in the stomach of some "evil beast" (as he supposed), and not in a grave. By "going to Joseph" he therefore intended to say "to the soul of Joseph." But where was the soul of Joseph? Not in the *grave;* no, nor in heaven.[1] Where then? In hell, or, if you please, in the abode of departed spirits. But what place was that? Not the *hell* of the damned, but a place distinct from it, as well as from heaven; for no one will say that Jacob supposed that the soul of his son was yet in heaven, much less among the eternally reprobate. Jacob, therefore, believed in the existence of a place in the other world, designed as a residence for those holy souls which, saved by their faith and good works from the doom of the wicked, were patiently waiting until heaven should be opened to them by the expected Redeemer. Their abode is known among Catholics as *Limbo*, or *Abraham's bosom.*[2] Lest this evident conclusion might be drawn from the text, and the existence of more conditions of being than two in the future world might thus be established, together with the probability that there is such a place there as purgatory, King

[1] Vide John iii. 13; Eph. iv. 8.

[2] A Lapide on Luke xvi. 22.

James's translators have represented *Sheol* as the *grave*, as if Jacob's language were absurd, although in other texts they had no hesitation in rendering *Sheol* by the word *hell*. The latest revisers, however, though they seem to have perceived the nonsense which the translators had put in the mouth of Jacob, left *grave* in the text, and, probably to save their own credit, placed *Sheol* in the margin, remarking as they did so that *Sheol* is "the name of the abode of the dead." But that is *hell*, for in *hell* as in *heaven* there is more than one mansion. This truth, however, the Revisers had not the candor to admit, and lest their readers might do so, allowed a word which they knew to be false and ridiculous to remain still in the translation which they undertook to correct.

These few examples, out of many of the same sort, will enable the reader to form a correct opinion regarding the moral character of the motives, under which the English translators of the Protestant Old Testament discharged the duty assigned them by his most gracious majesty King James I. Their version is full of errors, resulting not only from want of knowledge, but from the absence of all intention to present fairly the meaning of all such texts, as bore in any way on points of controversy between themselves and their Catholic fellow-subjects. Several of these errors; after others, which had long done duty in advancing the Protestant cause, had been removed; have disappeared in the recent revision, though they still hold their position in the yet current old Protestant Bible. But that revision seems deficient, not only in thoroughness but even in honesty. For in any honest revision the meaning of *Sheol*, for example, would be decided not by dogmatic views, but by the context. Now let us see what sort of a New Testament the Anglican translators prepared for English Protestant readers.

The character of that translation which was made of the New Testament under the auspices of King James I., and published in 1611, is fairly enough described by its most recent revisers, when, after remarking in their preface to it, that "That translation was the work of many hands and of several generations," they naively acknowledge that "The foundation was laid by William Tyndale. His translation of the New Testament was the true primary version. The versions that followed were either substantially reproductions of Tyndale's translation in its final shape, or revisions of versions that had been themselves almost entirely based on it." Now we have seen [1] that Tyndale's translation, so far as it differed from the Vulgate, was Luther's German New Testament done into the Anglo-Saxon of that time. Since it thus appears that the English Protestant New Testament is mainly Martin Luther's New Testament reproduced in another language, and already discussed in the present work, it almost seems a waste of time to cull a few out of the many characteristics which distinguish that reproduction, for the purpose of showing that it is not unworthy the fallen monk from whom it derives its origin. Yet, inasmuch as the fact, that it has been always and is now received by English speaking Protestants in the Old and New World as a faithful, indeed the only, "authorized version" of the Greek original, is nothing less than a challenge to all other English speaking people, a few remarks regarding its claims may not be inopportune. These remarks will be restricted to but a few out of many defects, which, it is believed, prove King James's New Testament to be not only an incorrect but a dishonest version of the sacred volume, which it claims to represent.

1. It has just been seen how profuse the "authorized

[1] Supra., p. 304.

version," like all the earlier English Protestant Bibles, from which it has descended; is in the use of *image*, which, hardly ever in season, but generally out of season, it thrusts into the reluctant text of the Old Testament. This generous prodigality of so serviceable an interpolation is less marked, at least now, in the New Testament of that version. Yet even there may be detected traces of the lavish hand with which it has been dispensed in the Old. Take for example Acts xix. 35, where the original, as literally rendered, is: "What man is there that knoweth not that the city of the Ephesians is a worshipper of the great Diana, *and of the fallen from Jupiter?*" (Greek, *Diopetous*; Vulgate, *Jovisque prolis*; Douay Bible, *Jupiter's offspring.*) The last words of the text in the "authorized version" are: "and of the *image* which fell down from Jupiter," although *image* is not at all expressed in the original, and even Protestant writers[1] often call the idol worshipped by the Ephesians a *statue* or a *figure*. But as *image* had proved itself so useful a word already, the preference was given to it after it had been decided to add to the text. And the revisers allowed that word to retain the place into which it had been foisted, as if they, too, could occasionally stoop to the base means employed by the translators for traducing the worship of their Catholic forefathers. Another outrageous falsification of the text perpetrated by the Protestant translators, and for the same unholy purpose, occurs in Romans xi. 4, where the Greek, as honestly rendered, says: "I have left to myself seven thousand men, that have not bent the knee *to Baal.*" Here again was a glorious chance for King James's translators, and they utilized it by substituting "to the *image* of Baal" for the two last words. This was too much even for the revisers; so, to their credit be it spoken, they

[1] Kitto's *Cycl.*: *Artemis, Ephesus.*

quietly condemned the shameless dishonesty of the translators, by restoring the true rendering.

2. Now let the reader who has some knowledge of Greek look at Mat. xix. 11. There he will find words pronounced thus, "*ou pantes chorousi ton logon touton all' hois didotai,*" and will agree that the Douay Bible reproduces them faithfully, and that the following version, substantially identical with that of the Douay Bible, is a word-for-word rendering of the text,—"All men *do not* take this word, but they to whom it is given." In the English Protestant or "authorized version it is: "All men *cannot* receive this saying, save they to whom it is given," the variation arising from the meaning given to *chorousi*. But about that meaning there is not even room for controversy. For *choreo*, of which *chorousi* in the text is the indicative mood, third person plural, means primarily to *make* or *give room* or *place*, as in Mark ii. 2; then, as a consequence, to *take* or *receive*, as in Matt. xix. 11, II. Cor. vii. 2; and to *contain* or *hold*, as in John ii. 6., xxi. 25. Now, bring the two versions into juxtaposition, that they may thus be more conveniently contrasted.

CATHOLIC— { "All men *do not* take this word, but they to whom it is given."

PROTESTANT— { "All men *cannot* receive this saying, save they to whom it is given."

Thus it is seen that, except as between *do not* and *cannot*, the two versions may be considered substantially identical. But it is evident that between *do not* and *cannot* there is quite a difference. The former expresses an omission to act, the latter a want of ability to act. Now let the Greek grammarian apply his rules, and he will say without hesitation that *ou pantes chorousi* means "all men *do not* take or receive," and that by no principle of interpretation can it be made to yield "all men *cannot* receive or take;" for, whatever else is implied in *chorousi*,

there is no allusion in it to power or ability; with the negative *ou* it refers solely to an omission to *act* or to do so and so. Were it otherwise, Our Lord (or St. Matthew, who has repeated His words), in the next verse, when employing *choreo*, would not have used in conjunction with it a word expressing ability, as "*Ho dunamenos chorein, choreito*,"—"He that *can* take let him take it,"—or, as the Protestant version reads, "He that is *able* to receive let him receive it." Indeed if King James's scholars have rightly interpreted *chorousi*, the Greek text last cited should stand thus, "Ho chorei, choreito," for this will mean, "He that is able to receive, let him receive." Finally, these royal interpreters, in gratifying their intolerant instincts, have not only, as we have seen, corrupted the text, but while engaged in this to them congenial work, they have plainly contradicted themselves. For they say that in the first text choreo means *to be able to receive*, and that the same word in the second text means no more than *to receive*. The latest revision of the English Protestant Bible has left Matt. xix. 11 unchanged, except that it substitutes the *but* of the Rhemish version for the *save* of the former.

No one can be mistaken as to the motive which prompted the falsification of the sacred text, in the case just referred to. The authors of that falsification had read Luther's sermon on marriage, or had adopted the principles proclaimed in that and other scandalous productions of the German reformer. By nature and education, these authors were therefore opposed to clerical celibacy and the continence so highly commended in the Gospel and the writings of St. Paul. But was it not possible, by corrupting the sacred text as Luther had done, to show that the Catholic Church was in error in these as well as other points? Those who wrote the English Protestant version of the Bible thought so. They not only thought so, but did so. And thus, up to

the present day, the New Testament which they prepared for their followers represents, as we have just seen, Our Lord Himself teaching a doctrine which He condemned, and uttering words His divine lips never pronounced.

3. A similar motive has led to a similar corruption in I. Cor. vii. 9, where, according to the original, the Rhemish version has "But if they *do not* contain themselves, let them marry," whereas the English Protestant version has "But if they *cannot* contain, let them marry." Now, *cannot* here is as unauthorized as it is in the text just discussed; it is a sheer interpolation, and nothing else; not being contained in that *ouk enkrateuontai* of the original, which has occasioned the variation between the Catholic and Protestant versions in this instance. For, since Liddell and Scott, Oxford Protestant scholars, one if not both belonging to the Anglican ministry, and therefore to Protestants unobjectionable authorities, state in their Lexicon that *enkrateuontai* is a verb "dep. mid.," meaning "to exercise self-control, *N. T.*," and since the word in the Greek New Testament is in the indicative mood, present tense, third person plural, it must therefore, according to Liddell and Scott, mean "they exercise self-control;" but this in sense is the same as the Catholic version with the *ouk* (not) of the original—"they do not contain themselves." There is therefore no room for the Protestant *cannot* in the text. There it is a false and unauthorized exotic. These impious attempts to pervert the meaning of the Scriptures, as well as the unauthorized restriction put in I. Cor. ix. 5 on the force of *gunaika*,[1] which, as appears from the context, means a *woman*, not a *wife*, as the Protestant New Testament has it, convict King James's translators of a deliberate purpose to falsify the original, in order that from it thus falsified they might draw

[1] Supra, 295.

arguments against the moral principles inculcated by the Church, and be able to cite Scriptural texts in favor of the uxorious proclivities in which they and their ministerial brethren indulged without scruple. The revisers were not satisfied with the text under discussion as it stood in the "authorized version." So they substituted for it "But if they have not continency." This, though an improvement, falls short of the original, implying as it does that the ability to exercise continency, self-control, self-restraint, has been withheld from some, whereas the original clearly enough teaches that the omission to "contain themselves" results not from a want of ability, but from a want of will.

4. The necessity of Communion under both kinds was and is insisted on by Protestants of all denominations, who were also unanimous in their condemnation of the Church for administering Communion only under one kind. But it was felt by them that Scriptural texts were required to justify this novelty, and not finding any such that suited their purpose, they decided on manufacturing something adapted to the emergency. So, by a slight change in the meaning of one little word consisting of but one little letter, they succeeded in securing the authority of St. Paul for what they called "the use of the cup." This feat of legerdemain was performed by the authors of the Protestant New Testament while translating I. Cor. xi. 27, where the Catholic reads: "Whosoever shall eat this bread *or* drink the chalice, etc." Here the Protestant translators, undeterred by the awful majesty of God's holy word, interpreted by *and* the Greek word signifying *or*, making the text read thus: "Whosoever shall eat this bread *and* drink this cup, etc.," although in the only four other places where the same Greek disjunctive certainly occurs in the same chapter, they, having no sinister purpose to serve, had already rendered the word by *or*.

The revisers, however, in this instance, have corrected the authorized version by substituting *or* for *and*, thus practically confessing that their predecessors hesitated not to corrupt the word of God whenever controversial considerations tempted them to do so, and that every educated Protestant throughout the world, then and since, who without a protest read these corruptions has shared in the sacrilege.

5. In Luke i. 72 occurs another perversion perpetrated by the authors of the English Protestant New Testament. The words in the Rhemish New Testament, as usual, coincide with the original, and have in fact been practically adopted by the revisers of the "authorized version." For the purpose of comparison, the three renderings are here presented together.

RHEMISH TRANSLATION,—	"To perform mercy to our fathers."
PROTESTANT TRANSLATION,—	"To perform the mercy promised to our fathers."
REVISION OF SAME,—	"To show mercy towards our fathers."

Between the Rhemish translators and the revisers in this instance the difference is very little, yet there is not complete agreement between them, because, while the former, according to their custom, adhere closely to the original by rendering *poiesai* literally, and thus writing "to perform," the latter interpret the same word by "to show," a sense in which it is rarely, if ever, found. Yet as "to show mercy" is practically synonymous with "to perform mercy," both versions may be considered identical; but both differ very materially from the version of King James's translators. These translators, while engaged on their task, seem to have kept one eye on the copy before them and the other on the Pope; and very likely not a line, nor even a word, was written by them without considering beforehand what its effect would be on the quarrel between England and Rome. When they came to the above text they must have paused be-

fore proceeding with their work. For the text was one which, if rendered literally, no one could read without being convinced, or at least suspecting, that the "fathers" already dead needed "mercy;" and that "the Lord God of Israel"[1] was prepared "to perform" it to them. But where were those fathers? Not in heaven, where mercy is swallowed up in joy. And assuredly not in the hell of the damned, where mercy could not reach them. They must therefore have been in a place between both, or neither the one nor the other. What? In Limbo or Purgatory? Why, certainly. In one or the other,—maybe both, according to their condition at death. But how were the readers of the "authorized version" to be saved from such a conclusion? Oh, well, as usual, by corrupting the text, and deftly slipping in the word "promised;" as if the assurance of mercy made to the fathers while living meant, that it would be all right with the children, after the mystery of redemption should be consummated. Is not this plan of getting out of a difficulty worthy of the men who devised it? Could Cerinthus, Marcion, or Tatian have done better?

6. Many of those selected by royal appointment for preparing a Protestant translation of the Bible were strongly imbued with the stern principles of unmitigated Calvinism. And the "authorized version" in several passages clearly reflects the influence, which they exercised in shaping its contents. Between them and the more conversative Episcopalians the work of interpreting was a game of give and take, and the result, as already remarked, has been a compromise. Each party seems to have experienced considerable difficulty, not only in overcoming the opposition of the other to certain renderings, but in reconciling the Bible with its own creed. But both, by the tactics they em-

[1] Verse 68.

ployed on the language of the Bible, and by the conviction that their task, if ever completed, demanded mutual concessions, were equal to all such occasions. Thus every problem that presented itself in the course of their labors was solved to the satisfaction of their credulous and confiding followers, by inserting a word here, changing another there, and generally treating the Bible as a volume whose contents, when they condemned, should be compelled to sanction Protestant principles, and when they favored Catholic belief should be so distorted as to make it appear that that belief was opposed to the Word of God. We have had several examples of this already. Here is another. It occurs in Hebrews x. 38. That the corruption which the English Protestant translators have perpetrated in this instance may be clearly apprehended, the Catholic version and Protestant version, with the last revision, are here placed side by side.

CATH. VERSION,— "My just man liveth by faith, but if he withdraw himself, My soul shall not delight in him."

PROT. VERSION,— "The just shall live by faith, but if *any man* draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him."

REVISION,— "My righteous one shall live by faith. And if he shrink back, my soul hath no pleasure in him."

It will be perceived here, that the variation between the Catholic version and the Revision is immaterial, indeed no more than what might be found between any two versions of different but substantially identical copies of the same document. They both, however, in sense as well as verbally, differ widely from the Protestant version. In both the subject of the two verbs *live* and *withdraw*, or *shrink*, is the same, and but one; whereas in the Protestant version these two verbs have each a different subject, though the original assigns to each the same subject, which is carefully retained in the Catholic version and in the Revision. Again, there is in the original no such expression as *any man*, or anything

like it. It is a clear forgery, which must be fathered on the Calvinistic element among King James's translators. But what motive could the Calvinists have had for committing the forgery? A very good one. Because, had the Protestant Bible, in this instance, been a faithful translation of the original, every reader would have seen that the Calvinists were wrong in teaching, that once just, always just, or, to quote their own "confession of faith," "the justified.... can never fall from the state of justification.[1] Further remarks on this glaring corruption are rendered unnecessary by what Dr. Adam Clarke has said on the subject. This writer, whose commentaries on the Scripture exhibit intense hatred of Catholic doctrines, expressed, too, in no very polite language, at Hebrews x. 38, gives the Protestant version, *but if any man draw back*, and the Greek words of which this is a pretended rendering, as well as his own rendering of them, thus: "*but if he draw back: he, the man, who is justified by faith;* for it is of him, and none other, that the text speaks." Dr. Clarke then continues: "The insertion of the words *any man*, if done to serve the purpose of a *particular creed*, is a wicked perversion of the words of God. They were evidently intended to turn away the relative from the *antecedent*, in order to save the doctrine of final and *unconditional* perseverance, which doctrine the text destroys."

7. Protestants very generally suppose that the inspiration of the Scripture, as we have them, is clearly established by several passages found therein, as if the point could be proved otherwise than by the authority of the Church. Among the passages to which they appeal for the purpose is II. Tim. iii. 16. But even this, were the rendering true which is found in the

[1] *The Constitution of the Presbyterians in the United States of America.—Philadelphia Board of Education*, ch. xi., art v.

"authorized version," would fail to demonstrate the point in behalf of which it is cited.

CATHOLIC VERSION—	"All scripture, inspired of God, is profitable to teach, etc."
PROTESTANT VERSION—	"All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, *and* is profitable for doctrine, etc."
REVISED VERSION—	"Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, etc."

The text as presented by the Catholic version and the Revision is substantially the same; in both the word "also" (*kai*), which appears in King James's version, is wanting; but this *kai*, as Griesbach has noted, should be omitted. And neither of the two has the first *is* of the Protestant version, because it is not found in the Greek. Dr. Clark observes that "This sentence is not well translated" in the Protestant version, and that the original... should be rendered "Every writing divinely inspired is profitable for doctrine, etc." Morever, that "the particle *kai*, '*and*,' is omitted by almost all the versions and many of the Fathers, and certainly does not agree well with the text." Now, what are we to think of King James's translators? Why! that they had no respect for either the Old or New Testament, except as a document to be adulterated as they pleased, and thus put in shape for sanctioning Protestant principles. Thus, in the present case, they, without the fear of God or reverence for His holy word, inserted *is* where St. Paul had not put it, that they might make use of this text to prove that "All scripture (their own vile version no doubt included) *is* given by inspiration of God." Ordinary readers would be unable to detect the corruption; while those Protestants who at the time were sufficiently learned to perceive such gross deviations from the spirit and text of the original would maintain a discreet silence, when they did not actually undertake to defend them against the attacks of Catholic critics. Does it not seem that all, who were concerned in preparing this

so-called *authorized version*, believed that any attempt on their part to correct the inspired writers of the Bible (rather the Holy Ghost, who spoke through those writers) was excusable, if made to promote the success of the Protestant religion?

A few other points remain to be noticed before this part of the general subject is dismissed. Professor W. R. Smith, then of Aberdeen, acknowledges,[1] as already remarked, "that the Reformers and their successors, up to the time when all our Protestant versions were fixed, were for all purposes of learning in the hands of the Rabbins;" and that "all sound Hebrew scholarship then resided with the Jewish doctors (!), and so the Protestant scholars became their disciples."[2] Immediately after he admits that "the Reformers and their successors did practically accept the results of Jewish scholarship on all these questions"—"the number of books in the canon, the best text of the Old Testament, or the principles upon which that text is to be translated."[3] What wonder, then, that, as the Professor adds, "It was left for a later generation....to substitute an authoritative Jewish tradition for the authoritative tradition of the Catholic Church—to swear by the Jewish canon and the Masoretic text, as the Romanists swore by the Tridentine canon and the Vulgate text?"[4] The wonder would have been, had "a later generation" acted otherwise; that "later generation," in doing as it did, was simply reducing to practice the lesson it had learned from the first reformers, who themselves had learned that same lesson sitting humbly at the feet of their Rabbinical masters, who claimed to know more about the canon of the Old Testament than the whole choir of Apostles.

Indeed, as a matter of fact, so far as the Bible was con-

[1] *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 44.
[2] Ibid., p. 46. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid.

cerned, the general sentiment among the reformers soon became as Jewish as it well could be without actually denying that the New Testament was an essential part of that volume. Had they done that, in view of the premises from which they started, their course would have been more logical than it really was. Practically, however, they seem to have taken far more interest in the Old Testament of the dead past than in the New of the living present. While Catholics, as had been always the case, generally received in baptism the name of some saint belonging to the New Testament, as Peter, James, John, Bartholomew, Thaddæus, Mark, Luke etc., Protestants preferred to select their names from the Old Testament, if not from pagan antiquity. And there were then, as there are now, few families among the latter not possessing a Noah or an Abraham, an Isaac or a Jacob, a Moses or a Joshua, a Samuel or a David, a Solomon or a Job, a Jehu or a Joel, an Elisha or an Elihut. By them Mesopotamia, Jehovah jiri, and other polysyllabic words of the Old Testament were pronounced with peculiar unction, while "the sword of the Lord, and of *Gideon*" (another favorite name among them) did duty as a war-cry to excite the fanaticism of all against the so-called Ahabs, Jesabels, and priests of Baal, whom the saints of the time doomed to destruction for opposing the progress of evangelical religion. Moreover, their local as well as personal names were selected by those enthusiastic admirers of the Bible frequently from the Old instead of the New Testament. It is thus seen that Jerusalem and Zion, Bethel and Bethlehem, Paradise and Galilee, Eden and Enon, Shilo, Sharon, Salem, etc., names peculiar to the Old Testament or common to it with the New, had for them a much greater interest than localities mentioned alone in the latter.

Besides, many of the early reformers, either to display their familiarity with Hebrew, a knowledge of which

they regarded as indispensable to the study of Scripture, or to depreciate the Septuagint and especially the Vulgate, the only copy of the Bible pronounced authentic by competent authority,—contended that God's revelation to mankind, before the coming of Christ, was to be found correctly written only in the Hebrew Scriptures, as extant in the hands of the Rabbins; and that the same points, divisions, names, every iota and every word that these Scriptures contained, had been dictated by the Holy Ghost. It of course followed that, if the Masoretic text were translated, no changes should be made, unless such as should be necessary to preserve the sense; and that all Hebrew names should be retained, letter for letter, as written in the original. Therefore in the Latin versions written by Junius, Tremellius, and other reformers, *Jesaaiahu* or *Jeschahias* is substituted for *Isaias* of the Vulgate, *Jirmeiæ* for *Jeremiæ*, *Jehhizkiiahu* for *Ezechiæ*, *Peretz* for *Phares*, *Chetzron* for *Esron*,[1] etc. Thus instead of *Samson* we should have *Shimson*; for *Solomon*, *Schlaumoh*; for *Mathusala*, *Metueshelach*; for *Nabuchodonosor*, *Nhuchadnetsar*.

All this may exhibit Hebrew scholarship, but it is a sorry display of common sense. For the translator of Ecclesiasticus,[2] as well as Josephus and Philo, and the author of II. Mach., who all wrote in Greek, though Jews themselves, together with St. Jerome, who translated the Hebrew Scriptures into Latin, in the translation of Hebrew names followed the custom established by the Hebrew scholars who wrote the Alexandrine version of the Hebrew Scriptures, some three centuries before the Christian era—that custom being to modify, as far as necessary, all proper names, so as to be easily pronounced by persons speaking the language in which the translators copied the original. Thus Josephus,[3] enu-

[1] Migne, *Script. Cursus*, Tom. IV., p 326.

[2] Chapters xlvi–xlviii.

[3] *Antiq.*, B. I., c. vi., § 1.

merating the descendants of Noe, after mentioning many names found in Gen. xi., writes that "such names are pronounced here after the manner of the Greeks to please my readers; for our country language does not so pronounce them." For a translator to do otherwise would be to render it impossible for his readers not only to pronounce as they should such proper names as might occur in his version, but to comprehend their meaning if such they should have. What translator, for example, would, when translating an Italian book into English, allow such a statement as this to appear in his version, or, if he did, what mere English reader would comprehend who or what was meant: "Giovanni told Giacomo that Arrigo and Giobbe had ran off to Parigi"? or what translator of common sense would not render the sentence thus: "John told James that Henry and Job had ran off to Paris"? In fact, proper names, whatever the language in which they have their birth, when passing into another always undergo such modifications as are necessary to adapt them to the vocalization of the people by whom they are adopted. This is a general law. And nowhere is its operation seen on a larger scale than in the New World, where so many Indian personal and local names, after various changes, have assumed the characteristics of civilized speech. And even the Hebrew language itself, though confined to an extremely isolated and exclusive race, has in the course of ages assimilated in the same way, and for the same reason, many an Egyptian, Persian, Chaldean, or other foreign word. For the Hebrew Scriptures, like many other compositions, are by no means destitute of such examples.

As just observed, when the Hebrew Scriptures were translated into Greek—that being the first known occasion on which a version of them was made—the translators arrayed in Greek costume the proper names

which they found in the original. And in that costume, so far as it was possible, they were admitted into the Latin version or Vulgate, made from the Greek version, it may be, before the close of the first century. It is unnecessary to observe that the orthography of the Vulgate, so far as that orthography concerned proper names, was followed throughout Western Christendom in all vernacular versions—which were all made from the Vulgate in England as well as elsewhere up to the time of the Reformation, when Protestant versions of the Hebrew Old Testament first made their appearance in Germany. But it was not until a later period that the earliest English Protestant version, made professedly from the same text, was completed and placed in circulation.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Other Peculiarities of the English Protestant Bible.

By the time that the so-called "authorized version" made its appearance, the absurd attempt of a few reformers—who "were for all purposes of learning in the hands of the Rabbins,"—to carry out the behests of their masters by perpetuating the Hebrew orthography of Old Testament names, had utterly failed—the insane effort of the crazy evangelicals, to impose on Christendom a pronunciation dictated by their Masoretic teachers, having spent its force. It has thus happened that the nomenclature of the English Protestant Bible is far less Hebraic that many of the Latin versions, which were writtten by the reformers in Germany. Indeed, the "authorized version" smacks no more of Hebrew than it does of Greek or Latin. The Revisers of that version say in their preface, that they "have endeavored to ascertain the system of transliteration which the translators adopted" with regard to "proper names,"[1] but do not appear to have met with any success. No wonder, however; for in truth the idea of a system for reproducing in English the names found in the Hebrew Scriptures seems never to have occurred to the translators; uniformity and consistency are the results of a system, but so far as the authorized version is concerned, its names as well as its renderings are neither uniform nor consistent. Thus parallel passages, that are identical

[1] *Preface to O. Test.*

in the Hebrew, are not, as the Revisers admit, always rendered by the same English words. And as to names, it would be an easy matter to select not a few, each one of which is written by the translators sometimes in one way sometimes in another, as if in such matters they had no other guide or system than their own capricious will. Here are some examples of the kind noted by "a member[1] of the American Committee of Revision :— Noah and Noe, Korah and Core, Hosea and Osee, Sinai and Sina, Median and Madian, Miletus and Miletum, etc., each two being made use of in referring to the one person or place."

Perhaps the most remarkable instance of the kind just referred to is that of the prophet surnamed the Thesbite,[2] who was contemporary with King Achab. The translators of the authorized version, throughout the Old Testament call him *Elijah*, but *Elias* in the New ; why the change, no one can tell, and conjecture in the circumstances would be useless. When, therefore, we find in the English Protestant Bible persons or books named Pharaoh, Josua, Ezra, Nehemiah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, instead of Pharao, Josue, Esdras, Nehemias, Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, Osee, Abdias, Jonas, Micheas, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggæus, Zacharias, Malachias, as they appear in the LXX. and Vulgate, the inference must be in all such cases, that the authors of the English Protestant Bible, in writing Biblical names, followed no rule or precedent, no system or principle, other than their own varying whims. For example, with them the prophet whom they call Isaiah in the Old, they name Esaias in the New Testament, and the prophet by whom he is succeeded is written by them *Jeremiah* in the Old Testament.

[1] Roberts, *Companion to the Revised Version of the English N. Test*, p. III.

[2] III. Kings xvii. 1.

Three times he is mentioned in the New Testament, but never as *Jeremiah* in the Protestant New Testament. There his name is written once *Jeremias* and twice *Jeremy* (why not Jerry?). *Jonah* of the Protestant Old Testament appears as *Jonas* in the New, while the name of the last but one of the minor prophets, evidently identical with that of the father of John the Baptist, is written by King James's translators *Zechariah* in the Old Testament and *Zacharias* in the New. *Esdras*, or, as the English Protestant version has it, *Ezra*, is nowhere mentioned in the New Testament, but the name is written *Esdras* by Josephus.[1]

In writing the names of other books, the authors of the "authorized version," with few exceptions, follow the Septuagint or Vulgate. They call *I.* and *II. Kings I.* and *II. Samuel*, perhaps because the Jews in the time of St. Jerome, after counting I. and II. Kings as one, called it *Samuel*, and later Jews, after restoring the twofold arrangement, restored also *I.* and *II. Samuel*. But as a name for these two books *Samuel* is not at all appropriate, for that prophet's life ended before the events described in the last seven chapters of the first occurred. Of the fifty-five chapters which comprise the two books, only the first twenty-four of the first have any relation to him. These books are therefore in no sense an exclusive history of his career; nor even if it be supposed that he as an author had anything to do with them, could he have written even half of the two. Then why call them I. and II. Samuel? They consist principally of the events which transpired during the reign of two kings, Saul and David, and as the author is unknown, and they therefore cannot be named after any writer, the title of I. and II. Kings is quite reasonable, as being adapted to the rank of the principal personages with whom they deal. The two books named in the

[1] *Antiq.*, B XI. v. 1., seq.

Septuagint and Vulgate, *I.* and *II. Paralipomenon* (things omitted, or supplement) are called in the "authorized version," *I.* and *II. Chronicles*, a word indeed equivalent to *Divre hajamin* (*words of days*), the name given them by the Jews. But as the Jewish title means also a *Diary* or *Journal*, these two books might have been as well so named in the "authorized version." The Hebrew *Scir hascirim*, Septuagint *asma ton asmaton*, Latin *Canticum Canticorum*—all signify the same thing—Canticle of Canticles—and the book known by this name to Catholic readers is so called in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin Bibles, but is entitled in the "authorized version," *the Song of Solomon* and *Solomon's Song*, a name which, though the book was written by Solomon, was first given it by the Rabbins in their disputes about its canonicity. But this name has been repudiated by the revisers, who call it the *Song of Songs*. In all these cases there is no reason to doubt that the Alexandrine translators gave to each book the Greek equivalent of the title it bore in the Hebrew copy before them, and that, if that title is no longer found in Hebrew Bibles, the change has been made at some time in the interval between the age of these translators and that of St. Jerome. But one New Testament book in the "authorized version" bears a different title from that which the Vulgate, following the original Greek, has given to it. The last of the sacred catalogue is called, both in the Greek and Vulgate, the *Apocalypse*, but in the authorized version," *Revelation*, a correct alternate certainly. But why the change? For the former word was probably as much at home in England as the latter when that version was written, since it was used [1] by Milton, who was born some years before that time. If the motive of those who wrote that version was to render a word originally Greek more intelligible to English

[1] Worcester's *Dictionary*.

readers, why did they not substitute *departure*, or *outgoing*, for that other Biblical Greek title *Exodus?* But, as the remark of the revisers implies, there is no use in trying to ascertain the system adopted by the translators in the transliteration of names. For their work proves that they had nothing of the kind, and probably did not think it necessary; rather, perhaps, could come to no agreement on the point, as the two parties among them seem to have been engaged in a game of give and take all through.

That the two factions, of which the translators mainly consisted, were accustomed to swap words and passages, seems unquestionable. In no other way is it possible to account for the fact that in some instances a text in the original, about whose true meaning there could have been no doubt, is wrongly interpreted so as to make it harmonize with some doctrine held by one faction; while in other instances a word or sentence, whose meaning was patent, was also wrongly interpreted to adapt it to some principle advocated by the opposing faction. This system of verbal exchange between the two factions has extended often to mere single words; and it is for this reason that different English equivalents are frequently given by the translators for the same word in the original, even when the context did not demand any variation in the rendering. Thus, as the Calvinists were allowed to interpret Hebrews x. 38 in such a way as to save their doctrine of "final and unconditional perseverance," they repaid this favor done to them by a similar one granted to the Episcopalians. The latter believed in the divine institution of bishops, rejected by the others, but as one good turn deserves another, they were permitted in Philippians i. 1, I. Tim. iii. 2, and Titus i. 7, to translate *Episkopos* by the word *Bishop*. But when Acts xx. 28., was reached, the balance of the account seems to have

been in favor of the Calvinists, who, as a matter of course, were allowed by their friends on the other side to translate *Episkopous* by *overseers*. However, when the translators afterwards came to I. Peter ii. 25, the only other text where the word occurs in the New Testament, that balance appears to have been the other way, for there *Episkopon* was rendered *bishop*. The revisers were composed of the same two parties as the translators —Episcopalians and Calvinists. The Episcopalians, however, had inaugurated the movement for providing every English speaking Protestant, the world over, with a genuine Bible, instead of the spurious volume issued by the translators. And as the work of correction progressed, they exercised a controlling influence in the deliberations of those, who took part in the enterprise. To them, therefore, is to be attributed the substitution of *bishop* for *overseer*, wherever the latter word was used by the translators. A concession, however, had to be made to the prejudices of their puritanical associates. And, as a consequence, wherever the reader meets with *bishop* in the revised text, his attention is directed to "*overseer*" in a foot note, even when the Redeemer is called the "Bishop of your souls." However irreverent the application of *overseer* might seem in this particular case, the Anglican element had to surrender its traditional conservatism in the interests of harmony.

In the only three texts where *diakonos* is found in the New Testament, it is invariably rendered *deacon* by the Protestant translators, as well as the revisers. This was to be expected, for the word is one about which, whatever its meaning, there could be no difference of opinion, as the principal sects, then and now, among English speaking Protestants had and have all their *deacons*, though the functions of these officials may not be the same in every case.

Presbuteros is another word which seems to have been an object of barter between the conservative and radical elements by which the "authorized version" has been made what it is; but in this case the radical element has been allowed to have its own way whenever the word presented itself. The privilege was earned, no doubt, in the course of mutual concessions made in the interests of peace,—though it seems strange that the conservative element never, even once, contrived to render the word by one which, as an anglicized derivative from *presbuteros*, was long familiar to those who represented that element, and was, in fact, the official name by which one of their orders of ministers has ever been designated during the three centuries of their existence. *Presbuteros* is met with more than forty times in the New Testament. In Acts ii. 17 it occurs in a quotation from Joel, and is there rendered *seniores* in the Vulgate, and *old men* in the Rhemish as well as the "authorized version." In all other passages *elder* is used as its English equivalent by King James's translators, *senior* and *ancient* by the Vulgate and Rhemish version respectively, except in six texts. *Senior*, *ancient*, and *elder* are practically synonymous, for the preference given by a translator to any of the three words may be regarded generally more as a matter of taste than of textual fidelity.

The six texts where *presbuteros* is not rendered *senior* by the Vulgate and *ancient* by the Rhemish version, but *presbyter* by the former and *priest* by the latter, are Acts xiv. 22, xv. 2; I. Tim. v. 17, 19; Titus i. 5; James v. 14. Evidently, the reason for adopting this rendering was the belief on the part of those who first translated the Greek New Testament into Latin,—and that was probably within the first century or very soon after,—and of those Catholics who translated the Vulgate into English, that by *presbuteros* in these six texts was meant a sa-

cred or regularly ordained minister, not a mere layman, however venerable, like a *senior*, an *ancient*, or an *elder*.[1] That all these translators were correct as to the word by which they rendered *presbuteros*, at least in several of those six texts, there appears no room whatever to doubt. The functions of the *presbuteros* as such, so far as he was a strictly Jewish official, were judicial and conciliar; civil, not religious.[2] Hence, to those who are so designated in the Gospels particularly, and in several passages which occur in other parts of the New Testament, the name of *elder* is not quite inapplicable, especially since *age*, as well as knowledge and integrity of life, was generally considered a qualification for the dignity. But, as an equivalent for the Christian *presbuteros* of the Apostolic or any other age, *elder* deserves no consideration; employed in that sense, it is altogether inappropriate, and must be rejected as false and misleading. The former word, no doubt, has a wide range, embracing, as it appears, all grades of the Christian ministry, from the diaconate upwards, as *diaconate*[3] seems to have been applicable to all below it. Thus, if we compare Acts xx. 17 with 28, we find that the word *presbuteroi* included bishops. The same fact may be inferred from a comparison of Titus I. 5 with 7, and is implied in I. Tim. iv. 14. Even St. Peter, who in the beginning of his First Epistle proclaims himself "an apostle of Jesus Christ," towards the end styles himself, prince of the Apostles though he was, a *sum-presbuteros*[4]—"fellow-presbyter." Need we wonder, then, that St. John commences his second and third epistles by announcing himself a *presbuteros*. In these three instances *elder* is the word used in the "authorized version." But nothing better could be expected from the translators,

[1] Worcester's *Dictionary*.

[2] Josephus, *Life*, 14, 38; *Antiq.*, B. IV., c. viii., § 14; *Wars*, B. II. c., xx., § 5.

[3] Phill. i. 1.

[4] I. Peter. v. 1.

Their business was to make the Bible proclaim in English, not what it contained, but what they themselves professed. This, however, merely by the way, as the point here insisted on is that each member of the Christian ministry as instituted at first, whatever the class to which he belonged, was sometimes called a *presbuteros.* And that point, so long as we are guided by the divine record, cannot be disputed. It does not, however, follow that there was no essential distinction between the various classes, of which that ministry consisted. To suppose that, would be a serious error. An *Apostle* could do all that an *episkopos*, a *presbuteros*, or a *diaconos* could do, and something more; but none of these could do all that the class or classes above him could do, although he could do many things which they as ministers did. He could, even if holding the lowest rank, baptize and preach the Gospel, for instance.

But, to return to those six texts, where *presbuteros* is translated *presbyter* in the Vulgate, and *priest* in the Rhemish version, there can be no doubt that either word is the only proper equivalent for *presbuteros* in several, indeed in all, of the texts indicated. Take for example the first of these texts, Acts xiv. 22. There it is stated that Paul and Barnabas, both called Apostles in verse 13, after having made many converts, "ordained" (Vulgate and "authorized version;") "appointed," (Revision) to them *presbuterous* in every church." These *presbuteroi* must therefore have received, whatever rite was performed upon them, power to provide the recent converts with all things necessary to their salvation, and to admit others to membership in the infant churches for which they were appointed. For, as Paul and Barnabas departed immediately, there was left no minister higher than the *presbuteroi* themselves. Now, had they been *elders*, they could not have labored "in word and in doctrine." They could not have ordained ruling elders

and deacons. They could not have administered Baptism nor the Lord's Supper, nor solemnized marriage, nor visited the sick, nor exhorted those present at a funeral "to consider the frailty of life." For, all these offices, and many others, are performed by ministers or pastors, not by *elders*, who are chosen "for the purpose of exercising government and discipline in conjunction with pastors,"[1] of whom, in the case before us, there was not one on hand, and consequently nothing to do for the elders, whom the "authorized version" says Paul and Barnabas ordained.

It is true that, since the "authorized version" was written, several sects have sprung up among English speaking Protestants. These, unlike the Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and others who were represented among the translators of that version, are not responsible for its faults, unless so far as a failure to protest against those faults might involve responsibility. Some of these sects have, others, perhaps influenced by the Episcopalians, have not *elders*. In only one, the Episcopal Methodists, does it appear that the *elders* are "ordained," the ceremony being performed by a bishop, who, however, as such is one of a class the first of which was ordained by a simple Anglican minister. But even if it be supposed that such elders have been all ordained by ministers having authority for that purpose, their ordination has been such as to raise them no higher at most than respectable laymen. For in some cases, as among the Presbyterians, the ceremony consists principally of a prayer by the minister. And even if among some sects it includes the laying on of hands, many of the adjuncts peculiar to it, as described in the Scriptures, are wanting, so that it cannot be supposed to confer on those who receive it any spiritual gift, grace, or power whatever.

[1] *The Form of Government of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S A.*, ch's v., v., xiii.—*Directory for Worship*, ch's vii., viii., xi., xii., xiii.

These adjuncts are, as indicated in the Scriptures,[1] prayer and fasting, the latter a practice seldom, if ever, employed outside the Catholic Church for ordination or any other purpose, but strictly enforced by her at each quarterly recurrence of the Ember days, when the Sacrament of Orders is usually administered. Prayer and fasting, however, even with the *cheirotonia*,[2] stretching forth of hands, and with the *epithesis ton cheiron*,[3] imposition of hands, which are one and the same act, or rather parts of one and the same act, as may be seen whenever holy orders are conferred in the Catholic Church, do not constitute a Christian minister of any kind. For this purpose an ordainer is needed who, besides doing as just explained, inherits by regular succession at least a portion of the power conferred by Our Lord on his Apostles. And it is only then that the grace, which was in Timothy by the imposition of St. Pauls hands,[4] is communicated in ordination. Were it not so, the rite of ordination, if performed by Simon Magus, would have produced the same effect as if administered by Simon Peter. It is unnecessary to add that a Protestant minister, whatever his rank, having (perhaps without any fault of his own) no connection with that venerable line to which the powers of the Christian priesthood have been divinely communicated, and through which they are preserved, is incapable of promoting by ordination any one even to the lowest grade of that priesthood. He himself, should he by the mercy of God be converted from his errors, after being very probably baptized, would be treated by the Church as a Christian laic, unless Divine grace called him to the sacred ministry; when, however, in every step he might take, from tonsure to holy orders, his previous ordination, by whomsoever conferred, would be regarded as null and void. But enough has been said to

[1] Acts vi. 6; xiii. 3; xiv. 22. [2] Acts xiv. 22; II. Cor. viii. 19.
[3] Acts vi. 6; xiii. 3; I. Tim. iv. 14; II. Tim. i. 6. [4] Ibid.

prove, that in the verse which has occasioned these remarks, there is nothing which would justify a translator in rendering *presbuterous* "elders." On the contrary, all the circumstances combine to attest that it was not mere laymen (for in the beginning of the seventeenth century "elders" were generally regarded as nothing more by Protestants) but priests at least, or, if you will have it so, ordained ministers, who were commissioned by apostolic authority to preach, administer sacraments, perform divine service,—in a word, to do whatever was necessary for the salvation of those over whom they were placed, and to labor for the propagation of the faith in the same way and with the same means as SS. Paul and Barnabas had done.

That a careful study of the other five verses in which *presbuteros* is found, or of the context in which the word occurs, will lead to the same conclusion, there is no reason to doubt. In fact, what in Titus i. 5 Titus is directed to do, is exactly the same thing which Paul and Barnabas had already done elsewhere, according to Acts xiv. 22; and, as in the latter case we have seen that *presbuteroi* constituted a grade of ecclesiastics higher than elders, so in the former case *presbuteroi* must, for the same reason, also designate a class of ecclesiastics whose duties demanded a far greater degree of authority than that recognized by any Protestant denomination in *elders* at the time, that the authorized version was written.

And as to James v. 14, there the use of the word *elders*, as an equivalent for *presbuteroi*, is perhaps the boldest attempt of the kind made by King James's translators to pervert the plain sense of the original. For the principal effect of the sacred rite divinely enjoined in that passage by St. James, whether that rite be or be not considered a sacrament, is one with the production of which a mere *elder*, as regarded by the two principal parties whose votes determined the character of the "author-

ized version," could have had nothing to do; namely, the forgiveness of sins. This grace was conferred on the sick man through the ministrations of the *presbuteroi* brought in by him, these ministrations consisting of praying over him and anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. Now, if this holy ordinance—for *holy* it is, since it is followed by the pardon of sin—may be administered by one, who has no authority even for visiting the sick—for the right to do so is reserved to ordained ministers[1]—it follows that the institution of the Christian ministry is to be attributed to superstition, not to divine appointment. For the Christian ministry, as all hold, has been ordained by God principally in order that sin and its sad consequences may be removed by the agency of that ministry. But here we have a case in which, according to the "authorized version," an *elder*, that is one who is not a minister, a bishop, or pastor,[2] can administer an ordinance, which cleanses from all sin a Christian in the most critical moment of his life, when perhaps he is about to appear before the judgment seat of God. Thus every Christian, who accepts the "authorized version" as a true copy of the Scripture, is compelled, either to admit that the word *elders*, which that version substitutes for the *presbuterous* of St. James, is a false translation, or to conclude that the Christian ministry is a snare, a delusion, a fraud.

The passage, as it stands, shows that the ceremony which it describes is as much a sacrament as either of those, which Protestants generally admit, baptism, for example. It has been "ordained by Christ," otherwise its administration would not have been enjoined by an Apostle, nor could it, when conferred, secure the forgiveness of sins. It "is a certain and effectual sign of grace."[3] In fact, there is in it the pardon of sins, so St.

[1] *Presbyterian Directory for Worship*, c. xii. [2] Ibid., passim.
[3] Episcopalian *Book of Common Prayer*, Articles of Religion, Art. xxv.

James assures us. There is also in it "a spiritual or sacramental union between the sign (the anointing) and the thing signified," [1] the cure of the wounds inflicted on the soul by "sins." Protestant writers, of course, reject the obvious import of the text, and allege that the anointing with oil was "recommended as a natural means of restoring health," and that any spiritual benefit to be gained by the ceremony should be attributed to "the prayer of faith." For, as they further argue, "oil in Judea was celebrated for its sanative qualities," and "was and is frequently used in the East as a means of cure in very dangerous diseases." [2] But the pardon of sins is mentioned by St. James as the consequence of all that, not of a part of what, was to be done by the *presbuteroi* when brought in by the sick man—their anointing of and praying over him. What is said by Protestant writers about the curative effects of oil, and its general use in Judea and elsewhere, is true. The same remarks, however, apply in a much greater degree to the importance, general use, and sanative properties of water. In fact, as one of the necessaries of life for man and beast, especially in those countries where the Jews resided, it has been and is still a matter of profound consideration; and we know that as early as the patriarchal period it was often an object of contention, and a subject of solemn treaties between the chieftains of that time, and their respective followers. [3] In fact, among all people it was ever of far more importance than oil; and this was especially the case among the Jews, who not only used water like other nations for drinking, cooking, washing, and preserving health, but employed it in almost innumerable ways for religious

[1] *The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.*, ch. xxvii., 2.

[2] Clarke in loco; Kitto's Cycl., *Anointing*.

[3] Gen. xiii. 10; xxi. 14-16, 19 25, etc.; xxiv. 11, 15, etc.; xxvi. 14, etc.; xxix. 2, etc.

purposes; for without it the ablutions and purifications perscribed by the law, under which they lived, could not be performed. Now, water, as is generally believed by all Christians, is an essential element in the administration of baptism, whatever may be the effects of that rite. But if the Protestant interpretation of James V. 14, 15 be correct, may it not be proved in the same way that water has nothing to do with baptism, and that that sacred ordinance, whether intended as a means by which those who receive it "are grafted into the Church," [1] or as a sign and seal of the covenant of grace," [2] is duly fulfilled, not by the application of water, which is recommended merely as a means for promoting cleanliness and health, but by "the prayer of faith" implied in the words with which the rite is performed. Besides, it is an intolerable tax on human credulity to ask men to believe that, after the entire Church, East and West, had all along been mistaken about the meaning of James v. 14, 15, the credit of discovering the true sense of that passage was reserved for a few expounders in the sixteenth century, who, without authority from any source, in heaven or on earth, had each constructed a new creed for himself and such as were willing to follow him. The disciples of these expounders are always ready to appeal to the practice of the early Church, when that practice coincides with their own. But when it does not, then their practice according to their new belief is more authoritative than that of Christian antiquity; and they even distort the Scripture and misinterpret its meaning, to convince their dupes that they are right. Such dishonest inconsistency is too glaring to escape the notice of any one not wilfully blind. Barclay, the learned Quaker, when answering their arguments drawn from the practice of the primitive Church in favor of

[1] *Common Prayer*, Articles of Religion, Art. xxvii.

[2] *Presbyt. Conf. of Faith*, ch. xxviii.

what they call "the Lord's Supper," had therefore good reason for asking: "How come they to pass over far more positive commands of the Apostles, as matters of no moment as. . . . James v. 14, where it is expressly commanded, *That the sick be anointed with oil in the name of the Lord.* "[1]

No one can deny that *elder* of the "authorized version," like its equivalent *senior* of the Vulgate and *ancient* of the Rhemish version, faithfully preserves the primitive sense of *presbuteros* employed by the inspired writers of the New Testament. But since it has pleased King James's translators in several, and their Revisers in all instances, after the example of the Rhemish translators, to insert in the English text *bishop*, not *overseer*, for the *episkopos* of the original, and has seemed good to both to render the *diakonos* of the original not by its radical meaning *servant*, but by *deacon*, the form it has assumed in ecclesiastical language (*bishop* and *deacon* being respectively regular English derivatives of the Greek *episkopos* and *diakonos*), does it not seem strange that the English Protestant translators should have rendered *presbuteros* by *elder*, instead of by *priest*, the English legitimate descendant of *presbuteros?* At least they should have done so, wherever the word *presbuteros* is applied to an official in the Christian Church. This seems to have been the rule followed by the writers who translated the New Testament into English at Rheims. And had that rule been adopted by those who prepared the English Protestant version, or by the revisers of that version, one very serious blemish which still disfigures that work would never have appeared, or, after having appeared, would, in the last attempt made to expurgate the work, have been summarily removed. For *priest* is as much a derivative of *presbuteros*

[1] *Apology*, Prop. xiii., § viii. p. 479. London Edition, 1780.

as *bishop* is of *episkopos*, or *deacon* of *diakonos*, and what is more, was as thoroughly domesticated in the English language, when the "authorized version" was written, as either of the other words. In fact, there is no reason to doubt that, in one form or other, it was assigned a place in the vernacular of England, when the people of that country embraced the Christian religion, and has maintained its ground in that vernacular up to the present time.

For *priost* [1] was the name, by which the ecclesiastic who said Mass, administered five out of the seven sacraments, and preached the Gospel with authority, was known to the people of England in Anglo Saxon times. He was also called "the Mass priest," [2] probably on account of the principal function he performed. What he performed this function on, was, as now, an "altar," and among the articles he used while officiating thereat were "a chalice" and "a chasuble." [3] That was as early as 833. Gildas the Wise, who flourished in the sixth century, speaks of the priests (sacerdotes) "extending their hands at venerable altars over the most holy sacrifices of Christ." [4] Now read the prayer recited, according to an Anglo Saxon Pontifical of the eighth century, and written in Anglo Saxon characters, by a bishop when conferring priestly orders on a candidate. "Do Thou, O Lord, infuse the hand of Thy benediction over this Thy *servant*, whom we dedicate to the honor of the *presbytery* (presbyterii), that.... he may preserve the gift of Thy ministry pure and immaculate, and through the service of Thy people may *transform* by an immaculate benediction *the body and blood of Thy Son.*" [5] And say, if the *servant* here mentioned was not on the conclusion of the

[1] Lingard, *Anglo Saxon Church*, p. 56, note 73, etc.

[2] Maitland. *The Dark Ages*, p. 29.

[3] Ibid., p. 242.

[4] *Bibliotheca Max. Patrum*, viii p. 716.

[5] Lingard, *Ang. Sax. Church*, note *N*, p. 295; original in Latin.

ceremony a *priest*, a real *sacrificing priest*, as that word is understood among Catholics, what in the world was he?

That the Anglo Saxon word *priost* (*priest* or *presbyter*) meant a sacrificing priest, there can be no doubt whatever, for among Anglo Saxon Christians *sacerd* was an alternate for priest.[1] And *sacerd* is simply Anglo Saxon for the Latin *sacerdos*, which always meant in Christian as well as pagan times a sacrificing priest. Besides, Gildas the Wise, already cited, who wrote in Latin, applies *sacerdotium* (priesthood) and *presbyterium* (presbytery) to the same state or office. The conclusion here insisted on is actually forced on our acceptance by the writers, who have flourished all along among the Christians of the West; or rather and better by the conciliar decrees promulgated in that part of the Church Universal. Look for example at canon seventy-five of the Council of Elvira, in Spain, one of the earliest councils held in Western Christendom, being dated 305 or 306. The heading of that canon is "concerning those who accuse bishops and priests (sacerdotes)." Then the canon itself commences thus: "If any one shall bring false charges against a bishop, or a priest (presbyterum), etc."[2] The Council, therefore, considered *sacerdos* and *presbyter* (priest) convertible terms. And it would be easy to prove that this was the case everywhere in the West.

From canon I. of the Council of Ancyra, a city of Galatia, held in 314, it appears that it was forbidden *presbuterous* (we are now examining the practice of Eastern Christendom) under certain circumstances to sacrifice (*prospherein*).[3] The *presbuteros*, therefore, was not only what the Latins called a *sacerdos*, but among the Greeks what they called a *hiereus*, the proper Greek name for a sacrificer. For the same reason the *presbuteros* could not have been what the Episcopalians call a priest, a name

[1] Lingard, *Anglo Saxon Church*, p. 56, note 73, 74. *Cath. Dict.*, priest.
[2] Hefele, *Hist. of Counc.*, I., p. 169. [3] Ibid., p. 201.

by which they designate their minister, nor could he have been a Presbyterian or Methodist elder, as no one pretends that either of the two sacrifices. Again, if the history of the Council of Neo Cæsarea, a town of Cappadocia, held 314–325, be consulted, it will be found that in its ninth canon it is stated that in certain circumstances a *presbuteros* should not offer the *holy sacrifice*, *me prospheretо* [1] (the latter word expresses the act of offering a sacrifice). Also, in canon thirteen, country priests, *presbuteroi*, are not allowed to offer the holy sacrifice, *prospherein*, [2] when the bishop or town priests, *presbuteroi*, are present. In three canons of the Council of Nice, 325, the word *presbuteros* occurs, and Balsamon, [3] the Greek commentatoi, treats it a as convertible with *hiereus*. In its eighteenth canon [4] this Council decides that the bishop or *presbuteros* should administer the Eucharist to the deacon, showing that the *presbuteros* held a rank between that of the bishop and that of the deacon. In the same canon [5] reference is made to *presbuteroi* sacrificing — *prospherein*. In the notes of the Greek commentators on the Canons of the Apostles *hiereus* and *presbuteros* are regarded as synonymous. [6] The 30th or 31st or 32d of these canons (they are not always numbered in the same way) refers to a *presbuteros* erecting an *altar* [7]—of course, it must have been to sacrifice. The Council in Trullo, convoked in 692, speaks of a "*presbuteros* mixing water with wine, and thus offering the immaculate sacrifice." [8] 'Tis as well to conclude this array of testimony with one or two statements on the part of the schismatical Greeks. Thus their hierarchy in 1572, at the Council of Jerusalem, declared that the "Oriental Church teaches that no one but a pious *hiereus* can consecrate the mystery of the divine Eucha-

[1] Hefele, *Hist. of Counc.*, vol. I., p. 227. [2] Ibid, p. 229.
[3] Beverage, *Synodikon*, vol. I. [4] Ibid. [5] Ibid. [6] Ibid.
[7] Ibid. [8] Ibid., p. 192.

rist.." [1] It further appears that this Council employed *hiereus* and *presbuteros* as titles for the same official, who, besides other functions, "offers an unbloody sacrifice," [2] and that Metrophanes, who was subsequently schismatical patriarch of Alexandria, treated *hiereus* and *presbuteros* as convertible terms in his "Confession." [3]

East and West, therefore, *Presbuteros*, in the course of time anglicized into *priest*, meant a person principally occupied in offering sacrifice, and in the East was considered synonymous with *hiereus*, while in the West it was universally regarded as another name for *sacerdos*. Both words, however, *hiereus* and *sacerdos*, corresponded in sense to the Hebrew *Cohen*, and all three were applied to one devoted to sacred functions, especially that of sacrificing. But a Christian *presbuteros*, on account of the victim he offered, was infinitely more of a sacrificer than a *cohen* among the Jews, and, for the same reason as well as on account of the object of that victim, was infinitely more of a sacrificer than the *hiereus* among the Greeks, or the *sacerdos* among the Latins, in pagan times. Besides, their victims were immolated in a bloody manner, his in an unbloody manner; the only Christian *hiereus* mentioned in the New Testament being Christ Himself, who is so styled [4] because His sacrifice was a bloody one. Here, then, we have the reason why the Christian priest, although appointed to offer sacrifice as well as preach and administer sacraments, is never once called a *hiereus* in the New Testament, but always a *presbuteros*. For, had he been there called a *hiereus*, he would have been regarded by Jew and Gentile as a Jewish or a pagan priest, or at least his sacrifice, like theirs, would have been considered the bloody immolation of some creature. And as the principal function of a Jewish or pagan priest was to make offerings of that kind, it would

[1] Kimmel, *Monumenta*, Part I., p. 462. [2] Ibid. pp. 383 440, 441.
[3] Ibid, Part II., pp. 13–93. [4] Hebrews v., vii.

have been supposed that the range of the Christian priest's duties was similarly circumscribed. It became, therefore, necessary to designate him by some title which, while it seemed to distinguish him effectually from the mere butchers who officiated as priests among Jews and Gentiles, would indicate that his sphere of action, as well as of duty, was far wider than that of the Hebrew *cohen*, or Greek *hiereus*. And as *presbuteros*, ancient, or elder, if you will, was a word well known to those among whom the Christian priest first appeared, and implied on the part of those to whom it was applied the possession of all such qualities as would render them venerable and influential, the name was appropriated to those among the followers of Christ who were ordained, or solemnly set apart by the Apostles, for offering the Christian sacrifice and coöperating with them in propagating the Christian religion.

To the Christian priest, therefore, was given the title of *presbuteros*. And thus, as well in name as in office, he was distinguished from the Hebrew *cohen* on the one hand, and the Greek *hiereus* on the other. Nor was it until his character was well understood, and there was no longer danger lest he might be confounded with either by the pagans, that he was designated by any other name. Not, therefore, until about the close of the second century do we find him styled a *hiereus* among the Greeks, and a *sacerdos* among the Latins, although *presbuteros* has clung to him all along, and in New Testament times included, as we have seen, not only him but bishops and Apostles. In the early ages it, in fact, was applied to bishops as well. But for many centuries it has served as a distinctive title of the Christian priest. Here it may be remarked, that in the Scriptures Christians generally are called "a holy priesthood," [1] "a kingly priesthood," [2] and "priests." [3] But it does not follow

[1] I. Peter ii. 5. [2] Ibid. 9. [3] Apoc. v. 10.

that there is no distinction between the priest and other Christians; the former is really a priest not only in name but by his office; the latter are priests only in a metaphorical sense, whether as to name or to office. God, through Moses, said to the children of Israel, "you shall be to me a priestly kingdom," [1] yet it is well known that among the children of Israel the actual priesthood, with all its rights and privileges, was jealously restricted to the descendants of Aaron. To assert, therefore, that all Christians constitute a priesthood, or are priests, is not to deny that that there is among them a special priesthood, whose members are invested with special authority and perform functions peculiar to themselves. Besides, it is clear from many passages in the Old Testament [2] that a special priesthood was to be instituted among the Gentiles and was to last forever.

But though, as age succeeded age, the existence of a Christian priesthood, as the word is now understood in the Catholic Church, was a patent and recognized fact wherever the Christian religion was professed in Great Britain or elsewhere, and thus demonstrated the fulfilment of the prophecy just referred to, the word *priest* had been rendered by the English reformers so odious to the English people, that it seems remarkable it did not become, like many another word, utterly obsolete in the English language. It is true that the Anglican establishment, as it arranged its clergy, had among them a class the members of which were designated *priests*. But popular usage pronounced the arrangement a fraud and a delusion, and those aspirants to the name as well as the honor, which none but a genuine Christian priest can justly claim, were generally recognized by no other title than that of *ministers*. In fact, not until very recently has a very small section of the class ventured to assume the name of priests; nor

[1] Ex. xix. 6. [2] Is. lxvii. 21; Jerem. xxxiii. 18.

are they ever so called except by themselves and a few followers, who like them belong to what is known as the "ritualistic school." The assumption, of course, was quite unwarranted, and must appear so to every reader who reflects that, as an intelligent Protestant writer has observed, "Priest is used to express the Greek *hiereus* and the Latin *sacerdos*, which in general signifies a sacrificer." [1] But the Anglicans among King James's translators were in no condition to resist the will of their fanatical associates, the ordination of whose preachers, elders, and deacons was as respectable and legitimate as that of their own bishops, priests, and deacons. So, *elder*, not *priest*, popped up in the "authorized version," wherever *presbuteros*, whether it meant a Jewish or Christian minister, appeared in the original. Men who had done their best to almost exterminate the last real *priest* and abolish his *sacrifice* in England, and had substituted for him a counterfeit, whose popular name was not what they without right or reason claimed for him, could not consistently contend with their radical associates that the *presbuteros* of the New Testament should, in any case, be represented in the Protestant translation by its legitimate derivative, *priest*. So, wherever *presbuteros* was found in the original Greek, they submitted as gracefully as they could to the interpretation dictated by those who detested prelacy only a little less than Popery, and were considered unnecessarily tolerant when they did not denounce all *priests* as ministers of Antichrist. But since the translators to whom Protestants are indebted for the "authorized version" have all through selected *elder* as the correct equivalent for *presbuteros*, and the latest revisers of that version have adopted the same rendering, does it not seem remarkable that the *presbuterion* (priesthood) of I. Tim. iv., 14 should have been rendered *presbytery* by the translators,

[1] Worcester's *Dictionary*.

instead of *eldership*, as good an Anglo-Saxon word as *elder;* and that the inconsistency should not have been removed by the revisers. But this, like many other blemishes of the same sort, was probably inevitable in a work executed by a class of scholars composed principally of two factions, each of which was mainly concerned in making the word of God reëcho it own views, and thus has contributed to make the English Protestant Bible what it is, a volume replete with not only unintentional but deliberate perversions of the original.

CHAPTER XXV.

A Reviser on the last Revision of the Protestant New Testament.—Reception of the Revision by Protestant Readers.

The translators devoted seven years to the task assigned them by King James, and the revisers fourteen to the self-imposed duty of correcting the mistakes made by the translators. Yet the version is still far from being what it might, indeed what it ought, to be. We should rather say, what it certainly would have been in the first place, had it been executed, or in the last placed revised, by scholars more anxious to reproduce in English the spirit and sense of the original, than to make that original subservient to the propagation of their own dogmatic views. That the translators performed their task in an unfaithful, as well as unsatisfactory manner, is abundantly proved, not only by the preceding remarks, but by the admission of the revisers in the introductions to the Old and New Testament, and by the voluntary statements [1] of Dr. Alexander Roberts himself, one of the English revisers. This writer notifies his readers in one place, [2] that, because the revisers made use of an amended Greek text, "a vast multitude of changes will be found in the Revised English Version" of the New Testament. Next he reminds them [3] of "the entire omission of the doxology of the Lord's Prayer at Matt. vi. 13," so that all English speaking Protestants have

[1] *Companion of the Revised Vers. of the N. T.*

[2] Ch. iii. [3] Ch. v.

been all along adding to that prayer words which the Lord never dictated. Indeed, they are likely to continue the practice, as the revision of the authorized version will probably never be generally adopted by them. In the same chapter Dr. Roberts, for various reasons satisfactory to himself, concludes that Mark xvi. 9–20 "is not the immediate production of St. Mark," yet, strange to say, "is, nevertheless, possessed of canonical authority." And he adds that "John vii. 53, viii. 11, stands on much the same footing" and "is probably. . . . no part of St. John's Gospel." Now, when it is further stated in the same chapter that "I. John v. 7, 8, bearing upon what is known as 'the heavenly witnesses' has been omitted in the Revised Version," it must be admitted that either the revisers wish to withdraw several important passages of the Holy Scripture from Protestants, or that the latter, in their simplicity, have all along been imposed upon by King James's translators, who, either through ignorance or malice, have inserted in the authorized version a number of paragraphs which were never written by an Apostle or other inspired author.

Add to all this, that the same writer [1] confesses that "there are cases in which they (the translators) have gone quite astray in the meaning assigned to the Greek." Of this he gives ample proof. Thus of one rendering he is compelled to confess, "it is certain this is quite a mistake;" of another, it "completely perverts the meaning." In another case he says, "the authorized version is a very inexact rendering of the Greek verb." Again, referring to Luke ix. 32, he admits that "this verse is quite misrepresented by the authorized version." Of John ix. 17 he observes that "here the authorized version is scarcely intelligible." Acts ii. 3, –"the authorized version is here quite wrong. Acts iii. 19, 20,—

[1] Ch. i., *On the Correction of Mistakes in the Meaning of Greek Words.*

"an impossible translation here occurs in the authorized version." Acts xxvi. 28,—"it is with some reluctance that we here abandon the rendering of the authorized version." Rom. iii. 25,—here the rendering of the authorized version, "besides being almost unintelligible.... is an utterly impossible version of the Greek." Thus the unsparing but honest critic continues to expose the gross faults of the authorized version book by book of its New Testament, from St. Matthew's Gospel to the Apocalypse of St. John, so that his Protestant readers must find it impossible to escape the conclusion, that the volume, which they supposed to be inspired, is after all but a clumsy counterfeit of God's holy word. Dr. Roberts furthermore asserts in the chapter where the preceding extracts are found, that in one instance "the authorized version contradicts itself," and he proves the charge. *Impossible*, *erroneous*, *absurd*, *wrong*, etc., are the qualifying terms applied to the manner, in which a great many texts have been rendered in the authorized version. But enough has been said on the gross mistakes, of which the translators were guilty in the meaning of Greek words.

The critic of the authorized version next proceeds to point out the corrections, which the revisers had to make of the mistakes committed by the translators in Greek grammar. And, *inexact*, *ignorant*, *guilty of every possible variety of error*, *blundering*, *exaggerated*, *misstating of facts*, *inconsistent*, *confused*, *mistranslating*, *erroneous*, *impossible* are among the expressions, by which he characterizes the blunders of the translators in this part of their work. Dr. Roberts's *Companion* is supplemented by a lengthy statement from a member of the American Committee on "the English Version of 1611, the Canterbury Revision of 1870, the American coöperation in that revision, the Constitution of the American Committee, the Relation of the American and English Commit-

tees, and the American part in the joint work." Then follows a list of American suggestions adopted. Another list of American suggestions rejected is appended, according to agreement, to the New Testament itself. But few of the suggestions made by the Americans were adopted by the English Committee, which, having inaugurated the work as well as provided for its publication, claimed, at least exercised, the right of deciding its character. As just observed, the readings, renderings, and changes proposed by the American revisers, but rejected by their English associates, are printed at the end of the New Testament and number at least some 300. A similar list of suggestions made by the Americans on the version of the Old Testament, but rejected by the Anglicans, is published by mutual agreement at the end of the Old Testament, and shows that in nearly 800 instances the emendations, which seemed to our countrymen necessary for correcting or improving the English Protestant Old Testament, were considered unsatisfactory by the English Committee. Many of the changes proposed by the Americans, whether in the Old or New Testament, deserved little consideration. But not a few of them, had they been adopted, would have rendered the Revised Version much less objectionable and certainly much more intelligible than it is. The Americans exhibited a commendable desire to have the version not only corrected but modernized, yet many of their suggestions savor strongly of the radical principles avowed by the Puritans, whose influence is perceptible all through that version. The English revisers, restrained by their traditional respect, even for the blunders and perversions of King James's Bible, and apprehending lest wholesale changes in the text, such as a due regard for the original demanded, might seriously affect their liturgical books, declined in several instances to correct errors which they must have perceived to be

gross and misleading. Both committees seem to have decided at the start, to ignore almost every one of the corruptions introduced into the authorized version by its authors for the express purpose of sanctioning their own religious belief, as distinguished from the creed of the Catholic Church.

The English, as well as the American revisers, can hardly find language sufficient to express their admiration of the authorized version. Yet it is evident not only from what has been said in the preceding pages of the present work, but from the voluntary admission of the revisers themselves, that the faults of that version are multitudinous and grave, and withal clearly betray a fixed purpose of misrepresenting the sense of the original, whenever that sense conflicted with the religious belief of the translators. Some of its faults may no doubt be attributed to ignorance, but these must be exceedingly few; since, besides various other sources of information, they had access to and actually made use of the Rhemish version of the New Testament published in 1582, and of the Douay version of the Old Testament, which made its appearance in 1610. This English Catholic version of the Bible was made by learned refugees from England. All reference to it is omitted in the enumeration of the English versions, which, King James's translators say, they consulted while preparing the authorized version. But that, while engaged on that version, they profited by the labors of those scholars who had already provided the Catholics of England with an excellent Bible, is sufficiently attested by the version itself. Indeed, the fact is admitted in the preface to "the Revised Version" of the New Testament, and in the "Companion to the Revised Version."[1] And there is no reason to doubt that, had King James's translators generally followed the Douay Version, the convocation of

[1] P. 157, note.

Canterbury would have been saved the trouble of inaugurating a movement for the purpose of expurgating the English Protestant Bible of the errors and corruptions by which its pages are defiled; though even then it might have been found necessary to remove from that Bible various typographical mistakes, and a vast number of variations, almost 24000 of the latter having been discovered by a committee of the American Bible Society, while examining only six different editions of the authorized version.[1]

As already remarked, the English revisers were not at all disposed to go as far as their American colaborers in removing the very objectionable features, which both recognized in their common Bible. Many words in that book are no longer English, and are no longer understood by common readers. Some are used, if used at all in writing or conversation, only by persons lost to all sense of shame and delicacy; others are used in such a way as to bid defiance to the plainest principles of syntax. Against all such monstrosities the American revisers protested, but protested in vain. Hence English speaking Protestants still read in their Bible *which* instead of *who*, where the reference is to persons or even to God, Matt. vi. 9; *astonied* instead of *astonished*, Is. lii. 14; and must be shocked when, instead of *harlot* and its correlative terms, they come across words which would defile the pages of any modern book. Examples of this will be found in the authorized, even revised version, at Lev. xxi. 7, Deut. xxiii. 17, Prov. vi. 26, xxiii. 27, etc. The minister who may have to read these and similar passages to his congregation, as well as the congregation itself which listens to him, are to be pitied. Then we have the unintelligible word *lian* substituted by the revisers for the plain word *lain* of the version in Num. v. 20; and in Exod. xxxix. 13. *ouches*, ap-

[1] *Companion to the Revised Version.*, p. 160, note.

parently unknown to common English readers, instead of *settings*. The English revisers made a remarkable change in Gen. xv. 2. There the authorized version had "Eliezer of Damascus." But "Dammesek Eliezer" was substituted for it. The Americans insisted that in this place no change should be made in the authorized version, but were overruled. They also endeavored in Num. iv. 9 and II. Paral. iv. 21 to have *tongs* replaced by *snuffers*, but failed, though they were right. In I. Kings xxx. 13 they tried to introduce *ago* for *agone*; but the Anglicans were inexorable; also *occurrence* instead of *occurrent* in III. Kings v. 4, but were again foiled; and xiv. 3, *cakes* for *cracknels*—in vain, however. Strange, is it not, that they did not propose *crackers* as a substitute? The word is in common use and fairly well expresses what was once meant by the now obsolete word *cracknels*, which the obstinate English refused to surrender. Our fellow citizens also proposed *attired* instead of *tired* in IV. Kings ix. 30, but the old word still holds its ground. And in II. Paral. xxxvi. 3 *fined* instead of *amerced*. But the amendment was rejected. *Sneezings* instead of *neezings*, in Job xli. 18, met a similar fate. *Betray* for *bewray*, Is. xvi. 3; *rely* for *stay*, Is. xxxi. 1; in Nahum ii. 7 *beating* for *tabering* (a word which has escaped the lexicographers); all these substitutes, as well as many others tending to render the authorized version at least intelligible, were rejected and relegated to an appendix.

The suggestions of the American Committee regarding what it considered necessary corrections of the New Testament in the authorized version, were, like those it subsequently made in reference to the Old Testament, some of them adopted. But a great number, some of them commendable, others quite objectionable, were assigned, as had been agreed upon, to an appendix, where the intelligent reader is enabled to pass upon their merits. It seems, however, that, as the Americans con-

sented that all of their suggestions not satisfactory to the Anglicans should be relegated to an appendix; the Anglicans should have condescended to group together in the same way all of theirs, which were not approved by the Americans. But as the latter seem to have perceived nothing unfair in the arrangement actually carried out, a disinterested critic has no right to complain.

Among the obsolete words which occur in the New Testament of the authorized version, and the meaning of which few English readers now understand, is *holpen* for *helped*, in Luke i. 54. Here the revisers made no change. To this may be added *wot*. This word is found, for example, in Acts vii. 40, and there belongs to a quotation from Ex. xxxii. 1; *know* is its modern equivalent. The translators of King James, having employed *wot* in Exodus, at least consistently made use of it in Acts. But the Anglican revisers, although deploring the inconsistencies of the translators, after substituting *know* for *wot* in Exodus, have very inconsistently retained *wot* in Acts. While casting the mote out of their brother's eye, they forgot to remove the beam from their own. *Wist* for *knew* still obscures the sense of Acts xxiii. 5 in the revised as well as the authorized version. And no intelligible word has been substituted by the revisers for *haling*, which King James's translators wrote in Acts viii. 3, and which might well have been replaced by *dragging*, as found in the Rhemish version. When the English revisers decided on retaining all such obsolete and barbarous words, they should at least have explained them in the foot-notes which accompany their work. Then look at the impropriety of using *of* for *by*, as in Matt. iii. 13, 14 and elsewhere, a construction so frequent in the authorized version and even in its revision; *twain* for *two*, as in Matt. v. 41, and so left in the revision; *meat* for *food*, in Matt. vi. 25, where the revisers substituted the proper word; *for* before the infinitive mood, as *for to be seen*,

Matt. xxiii. 5, a solecism retained by the revisers; *his* applied to a tree, in Matt. xxiv. 32, but for some reason or other replaced by *her* in the revision; they *be* for they *are*, a construction so frequent that it is unnecessary to cite examples; *spake* for *spoke*, as in John vii. 13 and elsewhere; *every whit* instead of *whole*, as in John vii. 23. Besides, far too much use has been made of italics in the authorized version. They were intended to supply something supposed to be wanting in the original. But their employment for any such purpose is an assumption of authority hardly to be tolerated in any translator. King James's translators have exercised it quite too often, and not always for the development of the true sense contained in the original. In John viii. 6 they have interpolated in this way quite a sentence, *as though he heard them not*. These words have been very properly omitted by the revisers, for there is nothing like them expressed or implied in the original.

Even were the authorized version a fair equivalent of the original which it claims to represent, the few examples already cited, and which could be indefinitely multiplied, prove that it is not by any means adapted to the intellectual wants of that comparatively large class of Protestant readers which, possessed of only a common education, sincerely desires to obtain a knowledge of God's revealed word. This same remark applies, but of course with less force, to the recent revision of that version. It must therefore be an occasion of profound regret to all classes of Protestants that, when the grave and numerons defects of King James's Bible were generally felt, and often publicly acknowledged by the learned among its readers, and as a consequence Protestant scholars in Great Britain and the United States undertook a revision of that Bible, these revisers failed not only to correct many of its statements in which it outrageously falsified the sacred originals, but to substitute

intelligible English for the almost innumerable obsolete words and expressions with which it abounds. English speaking Protestants in the Old World and the New, when it was known that the work of revision had been decided on, at least all of them who, without being highly educated, were able to read, did not anticipate any change in the sense of the authorized version, for they believed that every sentence it contained was as true as anything which Moses or the Prophets or the Apostles ever wrote, or even the Lord Himself ever spoke. But they certainly did expect that its language would be so intelligible, that in order to thorougly understand it they would be no longer compelled to provide themselves with a dictionary containing such Anglo-Saxon words as were still current in some districts of England about the beginning of the seventeenth century, but have long ceased to be spoken, indeed, are no longer understood, even by many well-educated people. Such Catholics, also, as might have taken any interest in the matter, no doubt entertained the same expectation. For to them it must have seemed quite inconsistent, indeed intolerable, that scholars who as controversialists charged the Church of Rome, untruthfully, however, with withholding the Scriptures from Catholics, should themselves persist any longer in providing their followers with no other copy of the Bible than one which was not only false, but couched in a language much of which was not understood by those followers for several preceding generations.

These hopes of what the revision would be, and indeed should have been, so far as concerned its idiom, proved fallacious. Yet they secured an immense demand for the New Testament revision, which was the first part of the work published. As soon as it appeared, in 1881, it was placed for sale in almost every city and town in the United States, and met with ready pur-

chasers. The public curiosity to examine it was almost universal. And every one who shared in the feeling could have it gratified for a mere trifle—ten, fifteen, or twenty-five cents at most. In the language of the trade, no book had ever such a run. Travellers in railroad cars and steamboats, guests at hotels, visitors at places of public resort, found it within easy reach, and, if not carried away by the curiosity that had seized on almost all, had the volume thrust upon them. No dime novel had ever such success among common readers, while those whose tastes craved something more solid than fictitious literature, devoted for a while, and probably many of them for the first time in their lives, their leisure moments to the perusal of what was presented to them as the New Testament, a book of which they might have heard, but which very likely they had never before read or even opened. The excitement, however, soon subsided. The market had been glutted. And booksellers, having discerned to their grief that the demand fell far short of the supply, were glad to dispose of the stock on hand at any price. Practically the book had ceased to be saleable, and present indications render it extremely improbable that the revision, whether for private or public use, will ever supplant the original version among English speaking Protestants.

When in 1885 the revision of the Old Testament was published, its appearance attracted very little attention. The Protestant public had been sadly disappointed in its expectations regarding the revision of the New. In that part of the work the revisers had consulted their own views, not the wishes and wants of their readers. Many of the latter seem to have read and studied that part carefully from beginning to end before the completion of the Old Testament revision was announced, and even to have studiously compared it with their old family bibles. They communicated the results of their inves-

tigation to the public press, and in several instances appear to have been shocked at the to them unexpected and startling changes made in a work which they supposed incapable of improvement, and which they honestly regarded as an immovable foundation, whereon to rest their religious belief. Nor were they in any way loath to express themselves, as if they felt that the ground on which they were standing had suddenly given way; one of these honest, plodding investigators, for example, astounded at the discovery he had made, startled the readers of a paper which enjoyed his patronage by telling them that in Rev. viii. 13. the revisers had substituted an *eagle* for the *angel* of King James's translation; what effect this announcement had on those who read it is not known. But the unsophisticated critic was right. For King James's translators, in this instance, had been imposed upon by Coverdale's Bible, when they should have been guided by the authority of the Rhemish New Testament and the best manuscripts. Other critics, more or less competent to decide on the merits of the revision, commented in the same way on many of the mutilations, corrections, and changes which, as already indicated in the preceding pages of the present work, were made by the revisers in the course of their labors. The sale of the revised Old Testament was therefore dull and unprofitable, as compared with that of the New. In fact, very few of the laity secured copies of the former. Their experience had taught them a lesson, and they profited by it. Ministers, by tacit or express agreement among themselves, frequently read portions of the revised New Testament to their congregations. But the members, it is understood, still reverently cling to the antiquated fetich which their forefathers set up, and will probably never accept in its stead the substitute proposed by the Convocation of Canterbury.

Intelligent Protestants, who, like the revisers of the

authorized version, are aware of the many important differences between it and the Bible, even as preserved in the existing Hebrew and Greek, and who are thoroughly conversant with the effects produced by that version, as well as others originating in the Reformation, may well seriously doubt whether much, if anything, has been gained to Christian society in consequence of that religious movement. The loss is patent; the gain, where is it? Time was when Christendom presented a united front against infidelity and all forms of religious error; when throughout the West as well as the East the professors of the Christian religion had but one creed, sat under the same pulpit, and knelt around the same altar. That was the golden age of Christian faith. It ceased, but not entirely, until fraudulent travesties, instead of honest translations, of the Holy Scriptures were placed by the reformers in the hands of all, and every one who could read was told that to interpret those counterfeits of the divine oracles was his inalienable right. One of these travesties has been the subject of the preceding remarks. The foundation of its New Testament was, as the revisers admit,[1] laid by Tyndale, whose version was cast in the same mould with Luther's, while its Old Testament was modelled principally after that of Coverdale, whose "Bible," according to the title prefixed to it by himself, was "faithfully translated out of Douch[2] and Latyn into English, MDXXXV."[3] Previous to the period in which those perversions of God's holy word appeared, the people of England, in matters of religion, were as a nation of one mind and of one speech. But what a change since! What domestic wars! What political contests! What religious strife! What rabid fanaticism! What multitudes driven into

[1] See their Preface to New Testament. [2] Luther's German Bible.

[3] Title-page of Coverdale's Bible in edition preserved in the Earl of Leicester's library at Holkham.

exile, impoverished, imprisoned, tortured, butchered, gibbeted, and all to a great extent in consequence of dishonest versions made of the Bible, and made for the purpose of maintaining errors never before broached, or broached only to be condemned by the Christian Church.

Besides, is it too much to say that, had it not been for the jealousy and strife fostered, if not engendered, by such versions, India, China, and Japan would have long since been converted to the Christian faith; that the dark continent of Africa would have been evangelized and civilized; that the arms of Europe, united by common interests as well as a common Bible, would have crushed out Islamism, or confined it to the home of the wild hordes which were the first to embrace it; and that the savage aborigines of the lands discovered in recent times would have been, most of them, already organized into prosperous communities or powerful kingdoms? These results would not be greater than those which, under the benign influence of a common creed and a uniform Bible, attested the wonderful progress of Christianity from the first to the fourth century, in spite of the combined forces of Judaism and Gentilism; and there can hardly be a doubt that the former results, commencing with the sixteenth, would have been accomplished by the close of the nineteenth century, had it not been for the dissensions fanned into destructive flames, if not into life, by the unfaithful and ill-omened version of Martin Luther and that other, produced by his worthy English imitators Tyndale, Coverdale, and Co. Here, then, we have on the one hand the actual and probable losses resulting to the cause of Christianity and civilization from the baneful influence of King James's translation in particular, because its influence was not merly insular or continental, but cosmopolitan to a certain extent. But where, on the other

hand, are we to look for the profits which man, as a member of society or as a pilgrim for eternity, has derived from that or all other translations produced by the Reformation? If it and they had never been written, would the state of human society be worse than it now actually is? Rather, would not many a page of human history, instead of redounding as at present to the disgrace of Christianity, be filled with a brilliant record of noble deeds done to elevate the human race, and of glorious sacrifices performed for the sake of our common Lord?

CHAPTER XXVI.

The Anglo-Catholic Bible.

Since the religious revolution which wrenched England from the centre of ecclesiastical unity, the Catholics of that country, and those who speak the same language elsewhere, have, so far as the Scriptures are concerned, been much better provided for than those Protestants who, whether from choice or necessity, were restricted to the use of such a translation as had been executed under the auspices of King James I. For, though the Rheims version of the New Testament, and the Douay version of the Old, were not free from defects, those defects, unlike the intentional perversions in the English Protestant Bible, were in no instance the result of a settled purpose on the part of the translators to extort from the sacred text arguments favorable to their own belief, or condemnatory of doctrines which they rejected. The New Testament of this version was published at Rheims in 1582, and the Old at Douay in 1609–1610, both being the work of Dr. Martin Gregory, who was a convert, and had been educated at St. John's College, Oxford. In preparing the version he was assisted by Dr. William (afterwards Cardinal) Allen, Dr. Richard Bristow, and John Reynolds, all of them, like Martin himself, trained at the University of Oxford. Their version is commonly called the Douay Bible, although, while its Old Testament was published at Douay, its New Testament was published at Rheims. The reason why it was so, was this. The English Col-

lege was founded at Douay in 1568 by the efforts of Cardinal Allen, but on account of political troubles was removed some years afterwards to Rheims, whence the translators, having published their New Testament, returned with the college to Douay and there completed and published their Old Testament. To the entire version were added notes; those on the New Testament were written by Bristow and Allen; those on the Old, by Dr. Thomas Worthington.

This Anglo-Catholic Bible was a translation of the Latin Vulgate, the best model, no doubt, in the opinion of its authors, which could have been selected for their purpose, not only because for many centuries it had been universally used throughout the West, but for the more special reason that the Council of Trent had declared that it was to be held for authentic. Some have expressed the opinion that the Latin Vulgate is almost coeval with the Apostles, its Old Testament having been translated from the Septuagint, and its New from the original Greek, both being retouched by St. Jerome about the close of the fourth century. Others believe that it is a mixture of that earliest translation, of the corrections made therein by St. Jerome according to the Hexaplar text of the Septuagint, of St. Jerome's own version, and of the corrections made by him in the text of the New Testament. The common opinion, however, is, that our present Vulgate is that actual version which was the work of St. Jerome, he having translated the protocanonical books of the Old Testament from the Hebrew, with Tobias and Judith from the Chaldee, and having with the aid of Greek manuscripts corrected the text of the existing Latin New Testament, but leaving the books of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, the two books of Machabees, with deutero Esther and Daniel, as he found them in the Old Latin Bible, which had all along been current through-

out the West. This Latin Bible, which preceded the age of St. Jerome by about two centuries, was called by him *Vulgata*,[1] by St. Augustine *Itala*,[2] and by St. Gregory the Great *Vetus*.[3] That, with the exception of the few books retained from it and just mentioned, the existing Vulgate is the production of St. Jerome, seems morally certain; else, why should Jerome's prefaces have been all along prefixed to the books, until near the end of the sixteenth century, when it was directed by the Sovereign Pontiff that these prefaces should be collected together and prefixed or appended to the sacred volume as they are generally now found, and thus all extraneous matter be separated effectually from the divine text. This single reason, though not the only one that could be urged, should remove all doubt with regard to a Hieronymian authorship.

But whether the existing Vulgate be the exclusive work of St. Jerome or not, it is evident that, even apart from the solemn sanction given it by the Church, no more faithful copy of the Scriptures as at first dictated by the Holy Ghost could have been selected by the Anglo-Catholic translators, as a standard in prosecuting the task they had undertaken. For it was the outgrowth of manuscripts, Hebrew, Chaldaic, and Greek, which had been written, studied, and collated, more than a thousand years before, by men familiar with the languages in which the revealed word had been originally communicated. Of the two last classes of manuscripts it would be difficult to prove, that any older than the fourth century remained when King James's translation was written. But it is certain that not a single one of the first, near so old as that, remained at that time, at least in the hands of Christians. At present there is none to be found older than the tenth century. King

[1] In cap. xiv., 29. xliv. 5, 6. Isaiæ.

[2] *De Doct. Christ.* L. ii. c. 15.

[3] *Ep. ad Leandrum* ante Mor. præfix. c. v.

James's translators, therefore, had to rely on Hebrew manuscripts more recent by several, probably twelve, centuries than those after which the Vulgate was modelled. The full significance of this fact will be best understood by those who are aware of the many mistakes which transcribers may make, and that the last of a succession of copies of any particular document, especially when no longer extant, is likely to be the most inaccurate of the entire series.

As a matter of course, the Vulgate has therefore been assigned a high rank among existing copies of the Sacred Scripture, not only by Catholic but by Protestant critics. Indeed, it would be an easy matter to cite a long list of the latter who have recognized the eminent merits of the Vulgate. But a Catholic writer is spared this trouble by Protestant critics who have treated the subject. Thus Brian Walton, Anglican bishop of Chester, after a learned dissertation on the Vulgate, says:[1] "But although we may not recognize it as divine, we admit that it is to be highly esteemed and not to be easily found fault with, both because of its antiquity and the general use which the Western Church has made of it for a thousand years, as also on account of the learning and fidelity of Jerome, whom we recognize as its principal author, and whom the most learned Protestants gratefully extol for the eminent services he rendered to the Church." Walton then, in confirmation of this statement, appeals to the testimony of Theodore Beza, the successor of Calvin; John Boys, Prebendary of Ely, who assisted in writing King James's translation, and was one of the six divines appointed to revise that translation when completed; Paul Fagius, appointed by Cranmer to teach Hebrew in Cambridge; Louis de Dieu, principal of one of the colleges at Leyden and professor of the University; and Hugh Grotius, one of the most

[1] *Proleg.*, x.

learned writers belonging to the sixteenth century. Dr. Wright of Trinity College, writing long after Walton, has thus referred to the Vulgate: "The most learned and judicious Protestants (Mill, *Proleg.*; Bengel, *Apparatus*; Lachman, *Pref.*) justly conspire in holding it in a high degree of veneration."[1] In regard to the New Testament of the Vulgate he cites Dr. Campbell, a learned Scotch Presbyterian divine, who died in 1796, and remarks that, "Dr. Campbell (*on the Gospels*) considers that, as the last part of the Vulgate was completed fourteen hundred years ago, and from manuscripts older probably than any now extant, and at a time, too, when the modern controversies were unknown, the Council of Trent acted rightly in giving the preference to this (the Vulgate New Testament), which he designates a good and faithful version, remarkable for purity and perspicuity."[2] To this array of testimony may be added the name of one who died in 1862, Thomas Hartwell Horne, whose authority on all Biblical questions is almost supreme among Protestants. This writer cites the authority of Richard Simon, the learned Oratorian, to show "that the more ancient the Greek manuscripts and other versions are, the more closely do they agree with the Vulgate, which has, in consequence, been more justly appreciated."[3] And Mr. Horne himself adds: "The Latin Vulgate preserves many true readings, where the modern Hebrew copies are corrupt." Besides, it is in evidence that King James's translators sometimes followed "the Vulgate in opposition to both"[4] Stephen's and Beza's editions, and that wherever they seem to have followed a reading which is not found in the principal

[1] Kitto's *Cycl.*, *Vulgate.*

[2] *Introd. to the Critical Study of the Scriptures*, vol. II., p. 239.

[3] *Histoire Critique*, etc.

[4] Scrivener's *Supplement to Authorized Version*, Kitto's *Cycl.*, II., p. 927.

editions of the Greek text, "their rendering may probably be traced to the Latin Vulgate." [1]

It must, therefore, be admitted that, when Dr. Gregory Martin and his associates undertook to provide their countrymen with a version, they could hardly have had a better copy of the Bible than the one which they proposed to translate. It may also be admitted, that they were all admirably equipped for the task on which they entered. For, while the others were by their education well qualified to assist him, Martin himself, who performed the principal part of the work, was distinguished by his knowledge of Hebrew and Greek (a fact publicly recognized sometime before at the university of Oxford),[2] and, while connected with the English College at Douay and at Rheims, was professor of Hebrew and Scripture in that institution. But this point need not be insisted on, as it is generally admitted by eminent Protestant writers, all of whom appear to re-echo the sentiment expressed by one of their own number, who says that "the Remish divines (who were evidently men of learning and ability) may occasionally do us good service, by furnishing some happy phrase or form of expression, which had eluded the diligence of their more reputable predecessors." [3] Can it be that the critic's last words refer to Tyndale and Coverdale, who translated from "the Douche and Latyn." If so, his admission is the more valuable. A less cynical critic declares, [4] that the English version of the Vulgate "is highly commendable for its scrupulous accuracy and fidelity, which cannot be predicated of all translations from the Vulgate in other languages." And certainly not of "the Holy Bible containing the Old and New Testaments trans-

[1] *Preface to Revision of Auth. Version of N. Test.*

[2] Dixon, *Introd.*, etc., Dissert. ix.

[3] Scrivener, *Supplement to Auth. Version*, Kitto's *Cycl.*, II., p. 926.

[4] Rev. W. Wright, LL.D., Trinity College, (Kitto's *Cycl.*, II., p. 926).

lated out of all the original tongues by His Majesty's special command."

The translators to whose learning and industry English literature is indebted for the Douay Bible, while prosecuting their laborious task, diligently consulted the Hebrew and Greek originals, deviating from each only so far as a due respect for the text of the Vulgate rendered necessary. The consequence has been that, though, to quote Mr. Scrivener again,[1] "in justice it must be observed, that no case of wilful perversion of Scripture has ever been brought home to the Rhemish translaters," yet another Protestant writer, Dr. Samuel Davidson, had, it must be confessed, good reason to remark that in the "Anglo-Rhemish version many of the original Hebrew and Greek words are retained, so that simplicity and perspicuity are sacrificed." Had the Doctor added that the phraseology of that version, on account of the Latinisms which appeared in it, was, like the Authorized Version, in many places obscure to ordinary readers, he would have been by no means hypercritical. But when he further stated that "it has been conjectured that this (the retention of Hebrew and Greek words) was done to render it (the version) as obscure as possible to the people," he should have candidly informed all who so conjectured, that they were mistaken; that all obscurities were afterwards removed from the version; that their own version is not free from obscurities; that in St. Paul's "Epistles. . . . are certain things hard to be understood," not only by the people but by the learned—a fault from which, if it be such, it has not pleased God to preserve even "the other Scriptures,"[2] and that, if intentional obscurity in this case were even a demonstrated fact, instead of being as it is a patent impudent fiction, it would not be so grave an offence against the sacred majesty of God's word as the gross,

[1] *Suppl. to Auth. Vers.* [2] II. Pet. iii. 16.

deliberate perversions of that word which occur in almost every chapter of King James's New Testament particularly.

The appearance of Hebrew, Greek, and Anglicized Latin words in the Douay Bible is, however, easily accounted for by the following circumstances, so that it is preposterous to suspect that the translators had any intention of withholding the Scriptures from the knowledge of the people. That they wrote any sort of version whatever proves indeed that they had no such intention. But their censor seems to have forgotten that they had been driven into exile by a Protestant government, which denied to Catholics even the poor boon of toleration; that they had to struggle with poverty [1] while at Douay or Rheims, where they were principally engaged in preparing priests, rather martyrs, for the English mission; that long and continuous absence from England, during which Latin or French was the principal medium of communication with those around them, must have rendered it difficult for them to express themselves correctly in their mother-tongue as spoken at the time; and that in their preface they distinctly notify their readers that they religiously retain the phrases word for word, "for fear of missing or restraining the sense of the Holy Ghost to the fantasie." As a proof of this they refer to such phrases as *ti emoi kai soi, gunai* (John ii. 4), which they render, "what to Me and thee, woman? explaining it, however, in a note thus: "what hast thou to do with Me?" The text of the Douay Version in this instance was a strictly literal translation of the original, which Bishop Kenrick rendered: "Woman, what hast thou to do with Me?" and the Authorized Version, as well as its revisers, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" The Anglo-Catholic translators had, as their work as well as

[1] In their preface they pathetically assign "lack of means" as the reason why twenty-eight years were occupied in preparing the translation.

their words show, their fears and their scruples. But the entire version of the Anglo-Protestant translators too well attests that they were troubled with no feeling of the kind.

It was once not unusual to find Protestant critics urging serious charges of incompetency or dishonesty against the writers of the Anglo-Catholic translation of the Vulgate. One of these critics was Hartwell Horne. But the grave charges which he brought against them in the seventh edition of his *Introduction*, having been proved false, were omitted in the eighth of the same work.[1] At present no respectable Protestant scholar would risk his reputation by saying anything more unfavorable of the Douay Bible than that its language is un-English—a charge which any Catholic may admit, and one, by the way, to which, as every impartial Protestant will allow, the Authorized Version itself is also manifestly open. Well indeed would it be for the latter, if no more serious fault could be proved against it. Yet the Hebraisms, Græcisms, and Latinisms which imparted a foreign aspect to the English of the Douay Bible, besides being a result of the overscrupulous fidelity with which Dr. Martin and his colleagues endeavored to preserve the exact sense of the original, have been much, indeed very much, exaggerated. Here are a few specimens which have been collected together by a modern Protestant critic. "Sindon (Mark xv. 46), zelators (Acts xx. 20), præfinition (Eph. iii. 2), contristate (iv. 30), agnition (Philem. 16.), repropitiate (Heb. ii. 17), With such *hosts* God is promerited (xiii. 16)."[2] Now, all these words, except

[1] Kitto's *Cycl.*, II., p. 926. note.

[2] For the accuracy of these references by Dr Wright, he alone is responsible; some, if not all of them, are inaccurate. The Douay translators, generally explain all such words in their notes, or at the end of the New Testament, in a list of "*Hard wordes explicated*;" several of the words selected above for condemnation by a Protestant critic are found in that list, the others are probably *explicated* in the notes. Such trifles, however, are beneath the notice of a Protestant critic writing as a controversialist.

two, *zelators* and *repropitiate*, were used by respectable English writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as any one may learn by consulting Worcester's Dictionary, and it is quite likely that a thorough examination of contemporary literature would show that the two words not catalogued by Worcester were also then in use. According to him *zealant* occurs in the writings of Bacon.

It thus appears that the Anglo-Catholic translators of the Vulgate, anxious to transfer to their Bible the full sense of that version, retained in many instances, probably wherever it was possible, the Vulgate's very words in an anglicized form, difficult, no doubt, to the common reader, but generally understood and employed by the best English writers of the time. England had already been flooded with spurious versions of the Vulgate written by Tyndale and Coverdale, with the assistance of Martin Luther's *Douche*, in a dialect with which the lower classes were long familiar. And it may have seemed to the exiled Catholic translators, that the best way to counteract the evil was to bring the Vulgate as near as possible to the capacity of educated readers, not only by rendering it literally, but by retaining its very words, so far as the actual stage which the English language had reached would permit. The leaders, thus enabled to perceive the true character of the Bibles imposed on the country, would, it may have been hoped, be in a position to convince the common people, who looked to them for guidance, that the Bibles with which they had been supplied so plentifully were only base counterfeits of the word of God. But whether such reasoning had or had not anything to do with determining the character of the Douay version, it is well known that at the time a great number of Latin words were struggling for adoption into the English language, and that several succeeded, retaining to this day the position then as-

signed them. But not a few, like the specimens given above, after a brief trial, have been discarded by writers and speakers. Unfortunately for the popularity of the Douay version, it contained many such words, current enough in England when it was written, but since consigned to oblivion, though still well understood by educated readers, the class to which, it would seem, the Anglo-Catholic translators particularly addressed themselves.

The Douay Bible, therefore, must have been read, if read at all, principally by persons qualified by their education to test its fidelity. On the other hand, the idiom of King James's Bible being a widespread provincial dialect, originating long before probably in Northamptonshire,[1] that Bible had as its readers generally only such as were unable to decide on its merits or defects by comparing it with "the original tongues," from which it professes in its title page to have been "translated." Its circulation was not, of course, confined to that class. For it as well as the versions prepared by Tyndale and Coverdale, with the various other Bibles descended from those versions and published in England before 1611, were patronized by many to whom, on account of their previous studies, their real character could have been no secret. But it was not to be expected, even if they took the trouble to ascertain that character, that men who owed all that they were and all that they owned to a religious revolution, started, pushed forward, and consummated to a great extent by the Protestant Bible, would condemn, whatever its faults, the agent to which they were principally indebted for their worldly prosperity. Indeed, it would have required a superhuman effort for competent critics, whose all depended on the maintenance of the system in favor of which that book was conceived, written, and put in circulation, to have declared what they honestly thought of the volume. Whoever might tell the

[1] Marsh's *Lectures on the English Language*, First Series, p. 622.

truth about it, it was their interest to defend it, and they did so in most instances without blush or hesitation.

Even at this day the revisers of the authorized version, while confessing and correcting a few of its many faults, are not ashamed to say in reference to what they call "this noble translation," "The longer we have been engaged upon it, the more we have learned to admire its simplicity, its dignity, its power, its happy turns of expression, its general accuracy, and we must not fail to add, the music of its cadences and the felicities of its rhythm." [1] Such is the extravagant and fulsome language addressed to the readers of the authorized version, who generally know no better, by those who find in that version the surest support of those opinions on whose perpetuation their all in this world depends. And this language has been repeated so often, so confidently, and with such a semblance of weighty authority, that Protestants very generally believe it, and few Protestant writers have the courage to criticise, much less to contradict it. But here and there may be found one with sufficient independence to utter a word of feeble dissent. Mr. Hallam, for example, without, however, daring to decide whether the authorized version is "conformable to the original text," hazards a few remarks regarding its "style," which, he says, "is in general so enthusiastically praised, that no one is permitted either to qualify, or even explain the grounds of his approbation. . . . but . . . . it is not the language of the reign of James I. It may in the eyes of many be a better English, but it is not the English of Daniel, or Raleigh, or Bacon, as any one may easily perceive. It abounds, in fact, especially in the Old Testament, with obsolete phraseology, and with single words long since abandoned or retained only in provincial use." [2] Need we wonder that

[1] *Preface to New Revision*, p. 9.

[2] *Literature of Europe*, Part II., ch. ii., p. 445.

this "style" was not selected by the Anglo-Catholic translators of the Vulgate? Or is any one aware that it was ever adopted or imitated by any writer or speaker except an irreverent newspaper jester, or Joe Smith, who had the phraseology of his book of Mormon fashioned after the same vulgar dialect which served as a matrix for the style of the authorized version?

Uncouth, unfaithful, barbarous, and extremely antiquated as King James's translation is in far too many passages, no reader, unless one whose imagination has been subjected to a due course of ministerial discipline, could discover in it what its well-paid and enthusiastic admirers are pleased to call "its dignity, its general accuracy, the music of its cadences, and the felicities of its rhythm." The truth is, that with an impartial English audience, and a merely tolerant English government, the Douay Bible, at least as revised soon after its appearance, when its Hebrew, Greek, and Latin words were replaced by current English, would have long since supplanted its pampered and dishonest rival, wherever the English language was spoken. This result would have been brought about by the ordinary operation of the general law, which, unless in exceptional circumstances, always secures the survival of the fittest.

The Douay Bible has been so modernized by frequent recensions, that existing copies of it look more like a new translation of the Vulgate than a revision of an old version. Expurgated its text never has been, so far as the sense is concerned, because, strictly speaking, there was nothing therein to expurgate. But what a herculean task awaits the enterprising scholar who will undertake to modernize the English Protestant Bible, and expurgate its text from all the corruptions which, notwithstanding the work of its latest revisers, still render that version quite objectionable. Besides, who would have the courage to engage in such a task, with the cheerless

prospect before him, that those whose knowledge of God's word he would thus propose to promote, have such an inveterate and irrational attachment to their hereditary Bible, that they would fail to adopt his corrections or even thank him for his labors.

The principal, in fact, the only valid objection that could be made against the text of the Douay Bible as it left the hands of its authors, was the retention of so many words exactly or almost as they were written in the original. Yet, for this the Douay divines may have had good reason. At least it is possible to conjecture such reason, without charging them with a deliberate purpose of rendering their version as obscure as possible, a charge as absurd as it is malicious. For, if that had been their purpose, would it not have been better promoted by leaving the Church's authentic copy of the Scriptures, as the Church herself had left it, in Latin. That would have rendered the Scriptures much more obscure to the people than the course which the Douay divines took. To them the meaning of many of the words in the original may have seemed obscure. Indeed, not a few of them still baffle the skill of the best commentators. And when they met with them, what were the Anglo-Catholic translators to do? Substitute definite English words for all such, and thus commit themselves, as King James's translators did, to a rendering which further investigation might show to be incorrect? No, as conscientious translators they could take no such liberty with the text before them, and so they decided sometimes to transfer to their version a word just, or almost, as they found it in the original, rather than impose on their readers a rendering of whose accuracy they were not assured themselves. Our separated brethren have had good reason to wish, that the translators of their Bible had been equally scrupulous. Had the latter translators emulated the fidelity

with which the sense of the Vulgate was transferred to the Douay Bible, a Canterbury revision, because unnecessary, would probably have never been heard of.

As a consequence of the rule thus imposed on the authors of the Douay version by their profound respect for the sense of the original, the reader is referred to the first among the specimens of what are called, by a Protestant critic, "the barbarous words and phrases" employed in that version, and indicated in a preceding page; namely, the word *Sindon*. This word has been applied in the original Greek, as well as in the Vulgate, by the first three Gospels to the shroud or winding sheet provided for Our Lord's body, after being taken down from the cross. Whatever was the material out of which the *Sindon* there mentioned was made, the textile fabric used on the same occasion is called in the fourth Gospel by its Greek name *othonion*, rendered no doubt correctly by the Vulgate *linteis* (linen cloths), by the Rhemish New Testament *linnen clothes*. Although the reference in the first three Gospels is to the winding sheet, while in the last it is probably to the strips or bandages in which the body and limbs were swathed to keep "the mixture of myrrh and aloes" in place, the writers of the Douay version had good reason to doubt whether *Sindon* meant the same material as *othonion* (linen). If it did, why did Matthew, Mark, and Luke employ it instead of *othonion*? Was it not better to retain *Sindon*, just as it stood in the Greek and Latin, and leave the readers of the Douay Bible to interpret it as they pleased, especially as the word was then current among respectable English writers? So Dr. Martin and his colleagues appear to have thought. So at least they did. That they were mistaken, it would be difficult to prove, although a different course has been taken by all other English translators, Catholic as well as Protestant, whose renderings of the two

words, in the passages referred to, substantially agree with each other, as appears from the following exhibit, where, for the convenience of the mere English reader, *Sindon* is written in the nominative case, though it may be found in the Greek and Latin text in some other case.

	MATT. XXVII. 59.	MARK XV. 46.	LUKE XXIII. 53.	JOHN XIX. 40.
Greek.	Sindon.	Sindon, *twice.*	Sindon.	Othoniois.
Latin.	Sindon.	Sindon, *twice.*	Sindon.	linteis.
Kenrick.	linen cloth.	fine linen, *twice.*	linen cloth.	linen cloths.
Coverdale.	lynnen cloth.	lynnen cloth, *twice.*	lynnen cloth.	lynnen clothes.
Author. Vers.	linen cloth.	fine linen, linen	linen.	linen cloths.
Rev. of Aut. Vers.	linen cloth.	linen cloth, *twice.*	linen cloth.	linen cloths.

Why Kenrick, in rendering Mark, inserts the word *fine* does not appear,[1] although his translation of the Vulgate, rather his revision of the Douay version, is furnished with copious and learned notes. All of them, in rendering Matthew, have before *linen cloth* the word *clean*, for it is in the Greek and Latin; St. Mark, as just indicated, has in the Greek *Sindon* twice in the same verse, once *Sindona* in the accusative case, once *Sindoni* in the dative. And the authorized version renders the first *Sindona* "fine linen;" but, as if to keep up its well earned reputation for gross inconsistency, it renders the second *Sindoni* simply "linen."

The substantial agreement thus existing among translators in interpreting *Sindon* by the word "*linen*," seems to prove that the writers to whom the Douay version owes its origin were mistaken in leaving *Sindon* as they found it, instead of rendering it "linen." That, however, is not so clear; for, while the rendering of the former leaves the mere English reader under the impression that all four evangelists apply the same

[1] Unless he was anxious, for some reason known to himself, to follow in this instance the authorized version.

term to the cloths used in the burial of Our Lord's body, the rendering of the latter, by showing that the expression of St. John was different from that of the other three evangelists, guards the reader against the false inference that the description given by the four evangelists is one and the same. It is true, there was some reason for believing that the cloths provided by Joseph of Arimathea for Our Lord's burial were all linen, as those used for similar purposes in Egypt were of that material, a fact placed beyond all doubt when mummy cloths were examined with the aid of the microscope. It would therefore seem to follow that those translators who represented by the English word *linen* the *Sindon* of the evangelists were right, and that the Douay divines were wrong in retaining *Sindon* in their translation; yet an apologist of the Douay divines might be permitted to remark that, though the microscope has shown that the material of the mummy cloths was linen, it appears that this was not universally the case, as it has been ascertained, in one instance at least, that "the mummy cloth of a child was formed of cotton, not of linen, as is the case with adult mummies."[1] Were there question, therefore, about an Egyptian instead of a Jewish sepulture, *Sindon* might, but would not necessarily have to, be rendered "linen." Besides, while embalming appears to have been universally practised in Egypt from the earliest times, and only ceased there about the sixth or seventh century of our era, there is no evidence to show that the custom was ever observed in Palestine to any extent. The "jam fœtet" of the Gospel proves that the body of Lazarus, who appears to have been respectably connected, was not embalmed. And even when some operation designated embalming was performed among the Jews, it was altogether different from what was known by the same name among the Egyp-

[1] Kitto's *Cycl.*, vol. I., p. 474. Many mummies have been found wrapt in woolen cloth; that of Mycerinus, an Egyptian Sovereign, was found encased in such material. J. Kenrick's *Ancient Egypt under the Pharaohs*, pp. 111, 118.

tians. The former, when done, simply retarded, the latter absolutely prevented, the process of decomposition. Besides, if the Palestinian method of embalming had been identical with the Egyptian, why should it be concluded that the textile fabric used on the occasion by the Jews was the same in all respects as that in which Egyptian mummies are now found encased. Furthermore, it does not appear that the Egyptians, in preparing their dead for burial, made use of such a cloth as the *Sindon* of the first three Gospels, which seems to have been a sheet in which Our Lord's body was wrapped when taken down from the cross, and in which it was laid while being swathed with the *othoniois*, linen bandages, before being consigned to the sepulchre. If these bandages were of linen, like the cerement of an Egyptian mummy, the *Sindon* of the Evangelists need not have been of the same material. Finally, and this should have some weight in deciding the question, a writer whose opinion is entitled to great respect, and who has devoted much attention to the names by which the various cloths were known to the ancients, states that "*Sindon* was the *general* term for every fine stuff; so that it was even applied to woolen fabrics.... Sindon was therefore any stuff of a very fine texture, and might be applied to modern Cashmere and Jerbee shawls, as well as to muslin and cambric."[1]

It is therefore at least far from certain, that, when the Douay divines decided on copying instead of translating *Sindon*, they were mistaken. But whatever be the merits or faults of their version, it was not honored by the *imprimatur* of a single bishop, much less by any formal approbation of the Holy See. It could boast of no higher recommendation than that of a few theologians connected with the College and Cathedral of Rheims and

[1] Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, II., p. 122, note 6.

the University of Douay.[1] The Rheims version was first published in a quarto volume, and the Douay in two quarto volumes.

[1] *A Catholic Dictionary* (Douay Bible).

CHAPTER XXVII.

Editions and Revisions of the Douay Bible in Great Britain and Ireland, with other Catholic versions executed for both countries.

Of this version, consisting of the Old and New Testament, and commonly called the Douay Bible, there have been several editions and revisions. And since it appeared, there have been two independent English translations of the Vulgate New Testament made by Catholic writers. The following details on the subject have been derived from various sources.[1]

In 1600 a second edition of the Rheims New Testament appeared in quarto, with some alterations and corrections.

In 1621 it was brought to a third edition in 16mo.

In 1633 a fourth edition in quarto was issued.

In 1635 there was published a second edition of the Old Testament in quarto, without alterations or corrections.

In 1738 a fifth edition of the New Testament in folio was put forth, the spelling being modernized, and the text as well as the notes slightly altered.

In 1788 a sixth edition of the New Testament (folio) was published in Liverpool, with the original preface and notes.

[1] Dixon, *Introd. to the S. S.*—Kenrick, *General Introd. to the N. Test.*—Newman's Essay on the *Rheims and Douay Version of the H. S.*—*Bibliographical Account of Cath. Bibles, Testaments, and other portions of Scripture translated from the Latin Vulgate and published in the United States.* By John Gilmary Shea, LL.D.—*Dublin Rev.*, vol. I., article ix.

In 1816 as well as in 1818 an attempt was made to circulate among the Irish Catholics copies of the Douay version containing the objectionable notes by which it was at first accompanied. But on both occasions the vigorous opposition of the Irish hierarchy rendered the attempt abortive. These attempts originated in a plan conceived in 1813 by one McNamara, a book-seller of Cork. His purpose was, as a source of personal profit, to reproduce in elegant style the Douay Bible, as it left the hands of the translators. Not finding in Cork the necessary facilities for such a work, and being himself possessed of very limited resources, he induced a respectable Protestant by the name of Cummings, engaged in the same business in Dublin, to have the book printed in the latter city. The approbation of Dr. Troy, Archbishop of Dublin, was asked and readily granted, that prelate supposing that the Bible was to be nothing more than a handsome reprint of one published under his sanction by R. Cross in 1791 [1] and further stipulating that, to guard the purity of the text, the proof-sheets should be revised by Rev. P. A. Walsh, a Catholic clergyman of Dublin. McNamara, having obtained a considerable number of subscribers among the bishops, priests, and laity, commenced publishing the book in numbers. But before it was completed he became bankrupt. Cummings, his assignee, having on his hands many unsold copies of the numbers already published, in order to indemnify himself, decided to utilize these by printing the remainder, and thus place the entire work in the market. This he accomplished, and the Bible was published in 1816. In the mean time McNamara, no way discouraged by his failure, resolved to have an exact copy of his former work printed. He commenced this second enterprise in 1817, publishing the edition as before in numbers, on the covers of which he copied the list of original sub-

[1] Infra, p. 410.

scribers, to which he added the names of others which he had procured subsequently. He succeeded in publishing his Bible in 1818. It, as well as the one already published two years before, contained all the objectionable notes belonging to the original Douay Bible. It is difficult to say whether this happened through an oversight on the part of Father Walsh, or through the bad faith of the publishers. But there is no doubt that in this matter the instructions of Dr. Troy were disregarded. Many of the notes in question, having been inspired in a great measure by the wrongs inflicted on the writers by the British Government, were still very distasteful to the advocates of English supremacy in Ireland, and were seized upon, as soon as they appeared in the editions of McNamara and Cummings, as an argument against Catholic emancipation,[1] a question which at the time engrossed public attention. To add to the difficulties of the situation, so far as the advocates of emancipation were concerned, Cummings, being a Protestant, and fearing lest the appearance of his name on the title-page of the Bible he proposed publishing would prevent its circulation among the Catholics of Ireland, substituted, with his consent however, that of a well-known Dublin Catholic publisher, Richard Coyne. To complicate matters still further, this very Bible of Cummings was also published at the same time by Keating and Brown in London, for *private* circulation, as was said, in Ireland. A very unfavorable criticism on the Bible, published over the name of Coyne, appeared in a British periodical, and Dr. Troy's attention was thus directed in the latter part of 1817 to the character of its contents. Indignant at the manner in which his sanction had been abused, he immediately issued a circular, in which the edition of 1816 was condemned. The effect of this condemnation

[1] As if Cummings, a Protestant, was conspiring with other Catholic printers against the stability of the British throne.

was fatal to the circulation, not only of that edition, but of that brought out by McNamara in 1818. The latter publisher, to escape the force of the condemnation, tried to secure the sale of his Bible by changing some of its leaves, but even then it could not find readers. Cummings, unable to find purchasers, was compelled to export to America the copies then remaining on his hands, some 500. The speculation was a most unfortunate one for McNamara and Cummings, and was probably the last attempt that was made, at least in Europe, to preserve from oblivion the acrimonious annotations with which the persecuted divines of Rheims had accompanied their English version of the Vulgate New Testament. We shall meet with McNamara's Bible further on.[1]

Notwithstanding the many editions through which the Douay Bible had passed, and the occasional efforts made to improve it, towards the close of the seventeenth century it was generally felt among Catholics that on account of its antiquated language, its obsolete words, and its faulty spelling, an independent translation of the Vulgate should be made, and the sense of the Scriptures thus conveyed as correctly as possible to English readers. Convinced of this, Cornelius Nary, an Irishman, Doctor of Laws of the University of Paris, and parish priest of St. Michan's, Dublin, in 1709 published in London a new translation of the Vulgate New Testament. It had the approbation of four Irish divines of Paris and of Dublin, and was republished in 1717. Actuated by a similar motive, Dr. Witham, an English divine, and president of Douay College, wrote another new translation of the Vulgate New Testament, with learned notes. It was published in 1730, having been approved by Dr. Challoner with other divines attached to the Douay College, and passed through a second edition. Neither it, however, nor Nary's, its predecessor,

[1] See next chapter.

seems to have been received with favor. For, both were superseded by the revision of the Rheims New Testament in duodecimo, which Dr. Challoner, whose memory as vicar-apostolic of the London district is still gratefully venerated by English Catholics, published in 1749. The illustrious prelate appears to have engaged in this enterprise from the same considerations in which the two independent translations mentioned above originated. But their failure to secure popularity convinced him that the demand of the Catholic public was not to be satisfied by substituting a distinct version for the old one, but by modernizing the language and style of the latter. In 1750, he brought out an edition of the entire Bible, including, therefore, a second edition of the New Testament. A third edition of the latter was issued by him in 1752. This was followed, in 1763-64, by a second edition of his revision of the entire Bible, which brought the New Testament to a fourth edition. In 1772, he had a fifth edition of the latter printed; it being succeeded, in 1777, by a sixth edition, the last which he lived to prepare, for he died soon after, in his ninetieth year, having devoted much of the last thirty years of his life to the further improvement of his revision of the Douay version.

The notes which Dr. Challoner inserted in his version were comparatively few, but judicious and inoffensive. His alterations, however, of the Douay text, though not deviating from the sense of the Douay version, were considerable, his principal object being to render that version intelligible to ordinary readers. In that he succeeded; but it may be doubted whether the phraseological and verbal changes introduced by him compensated for the loss thus sustained by the original in energy and impressiveness. Kenrick says, he is thought to have weakened the style by his inversion of words, an opinion shared by Cardinal Newman. In

fact, his revision might be regarded as a translation of the Vulgate, rather than a recension of the Douay Bible. Yet it was favorably received, and has ever since been the standard of the many editions of the Douay Old Testament and the Rheims New Testament published in England, Ireland, Scotland, and the United States. So that it cannot be said that the Douay Bible any longer exists among English speaking Catholics as the received version of the Vulgate.

Dr. Henry Colton, Anglican archdeacon of Cashel, 1855, was the first to remark that alterations made by Dr. Challoner in the Douay Bible were in the direction of the Protestant version. And it has been said by other Protestant writers that, according to Cardinal Newman, Dr. Challoner's revision approximated to that version. This is hardly a fair statement of the opinion expressed by his Eminence. It would be more correct to say that he has in a certain measure tested the accuracy of the statement put forth by the archdeacon, and has thus been led to observe that, besides inverting the order in which the words occur in the Douay version, and occasionally substituting modern words for those of that version, several examples of all which the Cardinal gives, "There seems no desire to substitute Saxon words for Latin, for 'set forth' is altered into 'declare'; nor, perhaps, to approach the Protestant version, though there often is an approach in fact, from the editor's desire to improve the English of his own text." The Cardinal again observes that, allowing for the connection between the Douay and the Challoner, "Challoner's version is even nearer to the Protestant than it is to the Douay; nearer, that is, not in grammatical structure, but in phraseology and diction." This, in reference to the Douay Old Testament. With regard to the Rheims New Testament, the same illustrious writer says, that Challoner "could not be unfaithful to the Vulgate; he

never would leave its literal sense for the Protestant text, which, on the other hand, is translated from the Greek;" that in several instances, which are adduced, he keeps to the Rheims, though "in one case, where the Rheims is with the Greek, he leaves it for the Protestant, which is not faithful to the Greek, viz. *eis ten katapausin*" (Heb. x. 3)—Rheims "into the rest," Protestant "into rest," Challoner "into rest." The latest revisers of the Protestant version have since confessed this mistake by attempting to cancel it.

The Douay Bible up to the time of Dr. Challoner remained substantially as it had been written. There had indeed been a second edition of its Old Testament, but, as we have seen, without alterations or corrections. There had also been during the same period five editions of its New Testament. But it seems that only in the last of these, 1738, was there any attempt at improvement, and that attempt resulted only in modernizing the spelling, and making a few verbal alterations, leaving the New Testament almost what it was in the edition of 1600. In the meantime, many alterations had been made in the Protestant version, not only, as is known, to correct its wilful or accidental errors, but no doubt to render it more readable. Dr. Challoner, in undertaking his revision, proposed not only to modernize, but to popularize the Douay Bible. In doing so it must necessarily have happened that, even though he might not have so intended, his phraseology in many instances coincided with that of the Protestant version, then a fair standard of the popular style, with which he wished the diction of the Douay Bible to harmonize. Cardinal Newman has selected at hazard Psalm lii. in order to exemplify the nature of the variations between the Douay version, the Protestant version, and Challoner's revision of the former. There are in the seven verses of which that Psalm consists twenty-seven

variations. In all of these the sense is the same, except one, in which Challoner, of course, agrees with the Douay, which, being derived from manuscripts far older than those accessible to King James's translators, is more reliable than the Protestant version. D. here represents the Douay version, P. the Protestant, and C. Challoner's version.

1.	Cases where P. followes D., and C. has its own rendering,	3
2.	" " D., P., and C. all disagree,	6
3.	" " D., P., and C. all agree,	2
4.	" " P. differs from D., and C. follows D.,	8
5.	" " P. differs from D., and C. follows P.,	8
		27

D. P. and C. are translations of one original. For the Vulgate, of which D. and C. may be regarded as distinct versions, is practically identical with the Hebrew of the Old Testament and the Greek of the New. It is not, therefore, surprising that all three versions in many cases, where they extract the same sense from the original, should express that sense sometimes in the same words, somtimes in different words. For it is always so in two or more independent translations of the same work into the same language. And no one would have a right to say that the more modern of any two such translations was intended to follow the other, because some of the renderings by the former are identical with some of the other. Now let the reader bear this in mind while examining the preceding examples, then say, supposing many of Challoner's alterations are in the direction of the Protestant version,—is it fair to conclude or to insinuate that the alterations in Challoner's revision, or in any of the editions prepared by himself or by others, were suggested by anything found in King James's Bible? Challoner's revision of the Douay and Rheims version was the first English Catholic Bible which received episcopal sanction; for, being a vicar

apostolic when the first revision of that version appeared, he was a bishop himself at that time.

The efforts to provide English speaking Catholics with the best possible copies of the Holy Scripture did not end with the life of Dr. Challoner. For, besides his revision and the various editions made of it by himself, not only numerous other editions of it,—some during his life, most of them subsequently,—but independent revisions of the Douay Bible, and, at least in one instance, a direct translation of the four Gospels from the Greek have been issued under ecclesiastical sanction or from Catholic sources. To begin with Great Britain, there is DR. HAY'S BIBLE, so called because printed in Edinburg, in 1761, under the inspection of the then Rev., afterwards Right Rev. Dr. Hay, one of the Vicars Apostolic of Scotland, and quite favorably known by his many useful writings. His Bible consisted of five volumes 12mo. In 1804–1805 it was reprinted. In 1811 many copies of it were imported to and disposed of in Ireland. At the same time a Dublin publisher brought out its New Testament, Archbishops Troy and Murray being among the subscribers. Another edition of this New Testament made its appearance also in Dublin, in 1814. And it probably supplied the text to an edition printed at Belfast in 1817. This Bible generally follows Challoner's.

DR. GIBSON'S BIBLE.—In 1816–17, with the sanction of Dr. Gibson, another Bible, which closely followed Challoner's, was published at Liverpool in folio. And in 1822 a reprint of it, also in folio, was made in London. It was published a third time in London, in folio, under the sanction of Dr. Bramston, then vicar apostolic.

POYNTER'S NEW TESTAMENT—appeared in 1815, with an address by Dr. Poynter and under the superintendence of Rev. Dr. Rigby, afterwards vicar apostolic of the London District. The text agrees with that of Chal-

loner. In 1818 a new edition of it was prepared by Rev. Mr. Horrabin, under the sanction of Dr. Poynter. It was in 12mo., and sold at a very low price, in order to place it within reach of the poorer class. Between 1824 and 1841 four more editions of it, one of which was printed in Dublin with the *Imprimatur* of the four Irish Archbishops, were brought out.

HAYDOCK'S BIBLE,—so called after its editor, Rev. George Leo Haydock, was published in 1811–12 and 1814, in Manchester and Dublin, folio. It is abundantly provided with useful notes, and generally adheres to Challoner's text. In 1822 it was republished in octavo in Dublin with shorter notes. Two years later another edition of it was issued. In 1845–48 it was reproduced with unabridged notes in Edinburg and London, with the approbation of the Scotch vicars apostolic, their coadjutors, and several archbishops and bishops of Ireland. In 1853 an edition of it in quarto, with abridged notes, was prepared by Very Rev. Dr. Husenbeth, with the approbation of his own superior, Dr. Waring, and the vicars apostolic of Great Britain.

SYER'S BIBLE.—When the original edition of Haydock's Bible was being prepared, there were two publishers, who were also printers, Mr. Haydock and Oswald Syers, the latter as well as the former apparently interested in the enterprise. Haydock employed his own brother, Rev. George Leo Haydock, as editor and annotator, while Syer succeded in issuing a rival Bible, also accompanied with notes, but without any preface or any intimation as to the quarter whence the notes were derived. Its text generally coincides with that of Challoner. It was published in Manchester, in 1811–13.

THE GLASGOW BIBLE.—This was an edition in 8vo of one published by Dr. Murray of Dublin. It was brought out at Glasgow in 1833–36, with the approbation of the vicars apostolic of England and Scotland.

Dr. Lingard's Four Gospels.—Among those who labored in Great Britain for promoting a knowledge of the Scriptures among their Catholic countrymen, the name of Dr. Lingard, the celebrated historian, deserves honorable mention. His translation of the Four Gospels from the Greek, with notes critical and explanatory, was published anonymously in 1836.

Cardinal Wiseman's Bible.—This edition, printed in 8vo in London, in the year 1847, has the approbation of Dr. Walsh, Vicar Apostolic, and Dr. Wiseman, his coadjutor. The text, instead of adhering to Dr. Challoner's, rather follows that of Dr. Troy, of which more immediately.

The preceding list of Catholic Bibles and parts thereof published in Great Britian, since the appearance of the Douay version, is not exhausted. But it is as complete as it was possible to make it with the means at hand.

The efforts made by the ecclesiastical authorities in Ireland to provide the people of that country with genuine copies of the Holy Scripture now call for attention. It has already been seen that these authorities not only gladly availed themselves of the earliest English translation of the Vulgate made by English refugees in France, and of subsequent editions of it issued in Great Britain, but were the first to recognize the linguistic defects of that translation, by proposing a substitute, and actually publishing an independent version of the Vulgate New Testament. In fact, the members of the Irish hierarchy, almost as soon as a relaxation of the penal laws against their religion permitted them to adopt measures for the dissemination of the Scriptures, had editions of the Douay version published throughout the country. And the following brief statement will show, that their zeal and success in the performance of this part of their duty increased, according as the restric-

tions imposed on the practice and profession of their belief by an intolerant government were gradually removed.

Dr. Troy's Bible.—In 1783 Rev. Bernard McMahon, a Dublin priest, published his first edition of the New Testament, in 12mo, with the formal approbation of his archbishop, Dr. Carpenter. It was made on the basis of Dr. Challoner's, but still with considerable changes of text. In 1791 the same clergyman was selected by Dr. Troy to superintend an edition of the whole Bible in quarto. From the approbation of Archbishop Troy it appears, that this edition was "carefully collated with the Clementine Vulgate, the Douay Old Testament of 1609, the Rheims New Testament of 1582, and with the London Old and New Testament of 1752, approved English versions." In 1794 it was reprinted in folio. There followed, in 1803, another edition of the New Testament in 12mo; and in 1810 still another, also in 12mo. In 1820, with the approbation of Dr. Troy, an edition of the New Testament, distinct from the series of which Rev. B. McMahon was the reviser, made its appearance. There are no notes appended to the chapters or verses, the sacred text standing absolutely by itself, though a supplement is added with the usual notes, which, according to the discretion of the publisher, might or might not be bound up with it. This was no doubt done in order to reduce the cost as much as possible, and thus enable the poor to secure copies. Of this edition 20,000 copies were struck off. In 1825 copies of it were reissued in London. Its text is said to agree exactly with Challoner's second edition of 1750.

Dr. Murray's Bible.—Archbishop Murray of Dublin, in 1825, had an edition of the Bible in 8vo published and stereotyped. Fresh impressions of it were produced from time to time in 1829, 33, 40, 44, 47, etc. The impression of '47 is in the possession of the present writer.

In fact, the reprinting of this and several of the other Bibles current in Ireland, England, and the United States is in almost constant operation, and the price is generally so low that every Catholic household finds it an easy matter to provide itself with a copy of the whole Bible, or at least of the New Testament. The text of Dr. Murray's Bible generally follows that of Dr. Challoner's. It has given so much satisfaction, that it has been selected as a sort of standard for some editions since issued, both in Great Britain and Ireland. The notes are few and brief, but the references quite numerous.

Dr. Blake's New Testament.—This edition in 8vo. was brought out at Newry, in 1838, and appears to adopt the text of Dr. Murray, agreeing with the early editions of Dr. Challoner. It was reprinted in Belfast, 1846–47.

Dr. Denvir's Bible.—Bishop Denvir commenced his series of New Testaments about 1836. Fresh issues are dated 1839, 41, 43, 45, and nearly every succeeding year. They were extremely cheap, having been struck off from stereotype plates. A copy now at hand, and dated 1839, contains the letter of Pius V. recommending "the reading of the Holy Scripture," and is followed by the assurance that it was diligently compared with the Latin Vulgate, and by the approbation of "† C. Denvir, D.D.R.C. Bishop of Down and Connor." The preface is by Rev. Daniel Curoe, P.P., Randalstown. In it the reader is informed that, "in compliance with the request of two distinguished prelates," probably Archbishop Crolly of Armagh, and Bishop Denvir just mentioned, "under whose sanction extremely cheap editions have been executed in Belfast, publishers of the first respectability have furnished an authentic statement recording the sale of three hundred thousand copies of the Douay Version." The text of this series very generally agrees with Dr. Murray's. The same bishop had the whole

Bible published in 1839. In another issue of Bibles his name appears in conjunction with Dr. Crolly's, in 1846 and 52.

Dr. McHale's New Testament.—Both the text and notes of this edition, it is said, agree with Dr. Murray's Bible, published in 1825.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Editions and Revisions of the Douay Bible in the United States, and of Various other Versions of the Vulgate made into other Languages than English, and Republished there.

It now remains to be seen what has been done in the United States to provide English speaking Catholics with the word of God. It cannot be doubted that many of the early Catholic colonists, from Great Britain and Ireland, brought with them to this country the Bible, which they possessed in their native land. For the Bible, or at least the New Testament, as well as the prayer book, the catechism, crucifix, and rosary generally constitute a part of the appurtenances found in every Catholic household, however humble. But as about the close of the last century our native Catholic citizens, together with the immigrant Catholics from the different countries of the Old World, and the converted Indians, did not amount to 40,000,[1] and a hierarchy had not yet been instituted, it is not to be wondered at that no publisher had sufficient courage or enterprise to undertake an American edition of the Douay Bible, or of any other Bible based upon it. Right Rev. John Carroll, a native of Maryland, who had been appointed Prefect Apostolic by Pius VI. in 1784, was, on Nov. 6, 1789, appointed Bishop of Baltimore, with the entire territory belonging to the United States

[1] *The Hierarchy of the Cath. Church in the United States*, p. 53. By John Gilmary Shea, LL. D.

for his diocese. His consecration took place in England, August 15 of the following year; and in the same year the first American Catholic Bible was published. Ever since, from time to time, as the following brief details will show, edition after edition has issued from the press of the country, as abundantly and as cheaply as the wants and means of the faithful demanded.

CAREY'S QUARTO BIBLE, 1790, Philadelphia. Printed and sold by Carey, Stewart & Co., MDCCXC. It is, as far as the text is concerned, a reprint of Challoner's second edition of the Bible. It contained the approbation of the first edition of the Old Testament, the approbation of the first edition of the New Testament by the University of Rheims, and the approbation of the corrected edition of the New Testament published in 1750.

In 1791 Dr. Troy's edition of the whole Bible appeared, and as it had given very general satisfaction, Carey, some years later, issued a reprint of it also, which is designated: CAREY'S QUARTO BIBLE; 1805, Philadelphia. Published by Matthew Carey, No. 122 Market Street, Oct. 15, MDCCCV. It is a reproduction of Dr. Troy's fifth Dublin edition, with maps of Palestine and the land of Moriah, including illustrations of persons and scenes mentioned in the New Testament. Carey's Quarto Testament deserves distinct mention, as Carey struck off, separately, copies of the New Testament contained in his Quarto Bible of 1805.

DUFFY'S NEW TESTAMENT.—In 1817 W. Duffy published an edition of the New Testament in 12mo, at Georgetown. It contained in Latin the approbation given to the original Douay Bible by the Universities of Rheims and Douay, and was published with the permission of "Leonard, Archbishop of Baltimore," who declared that, "it had been found strictly conformable to the Dublin edition of the same work printed in 1811, and also that printed in 1814." The publisher of this

Georgetown edition announced in some of the copies his intention of issuing an edition of the entire Bible, a project which, it seems, was never completed, but it led to the following edition in 1824.

CUMMISKEY'S OCTAVO BIBLE, 1824.—This edition was published at Philadelphia by Eugene Cummiskey and stereotyped by J. Howe. It was sanctioned and recommended by "Henry Conwell, Bishop of Philadelphia," declaring that it had "been carefully copied from the fifth Dublin edition." Later impressions contained the approbations of Bishop Kenrick, who succeeded Dr. Conwell, Archbishop Eccleston of Baltimore, and Bishop Hughes of New York.

CUMMISKEY'S OCTAVO NEW TESTAMENT, 1824,—deserves to be mentioned, as it was published and sold separately from the whole Bible printed the same year.

CUMMISKEY'S QUARTO BIBLE, 1824.—This edition was also brought out at Philadelphia, with the approbation of Dr. Conwell. The text follows Dr. Troy's Bible, and is accompanied by Dr. Challoner's annotations, and the volume is embellished with illustrations of scenes described therein.

CUMMISKEY'S FOLIO HAYDOCK, Philadelphia, 1825.—This is a reprint of Haydock's Bible, Manchester, 1811–14, fol. It has the original approbation of the latter, as well as that of Dr. Conwell. Besides the sacred text, it contains much useful and pertinent matter, and is embellished with several superb engravings.

CUMMISKEY'S NEW TESTAMENT in 32mo, 1829. Philadelphia. Stereotyped by J. Conner, New York. This edition claims to be "published with permission." The text is mainly that of Challoner's published in 1752, as we are informed, though the editor says it is "From the fifth Dublin edition."

CUMMISKEY'S DUODECIMO NEW TESTAMENT, Philadelphia, supposed to belong to 1829, stereotyped by J.

Conner, New York, and approved by Bishop Conwell. —The text mainly follows Dr. Challoner's of 1749.

LUCAS'S DUODECIMO NEW TESTAMENT was published at Baltimore, by Fielding Lucas Jr., approved and recommended by Archbishop Whitfield. It was printed from the plates of Cummiskey's duodecimo of 1829, and of course follows the same text.

LUCAS'S 32MO, NEW TESTAMENT with annotations and references, was issued at Baltimore by the same publisher and approved by the same authority. In other respects it is the same as Cummiskey's 32mo, from the plates of which it is printed.

THE DEVEREUX NEW TESTAMENT, Utica, 1829, "Approved by the Right. Rev. John Dubois, Catholic Bishop of New York."—This edition was stereotyped and printed at Utica by William Williams, for the proprietors, at whose instance and expense the enterprise was started and completed, in order to provide the Catholic schools of Utica with cheap copies of the New Testament. The text is that of Challoner's, belonging to the year 1750, and is taken from the Dublin edition of 1820; copies of the year 1840 have the name of Thomas Davis.

LUCAS'S QUARTO BIBLE, Baltimore, 1832.—This is printed from the plates of Cummiskey's quarto. It omits approbation of Bishop of Philadelphia, and some other matters preceding the text of the Old Testament. In other respects it conforms to Cummiskey's of 1824.

DOYLE'S OCTAVO BIBLE, New York, 1833.—Published by John Doyle with the approbation of the Right Rev. John Dubois, Catholic Bishop of New York, and stereotyped by Conner and Cooke. The text is that of Dr. Murray, of 1825.

THE AMERICAN PROTESTANT OCTAVO REPRINT of the Rheims New Testament, 1834. The source and purpose of this edition are such that it demands more than a passing notice. Here, then, are the contents of its title-page :

"The | New Testament | of Our | Lord and Saviour | Jesus Christ, | translated out of the Latin Vulgate, | diligently compared with the original Greek, | and first published by | the English College of Rheims, | Anno. 1582. | With the | original preface, | arguments and tables, | marginal notes | and | annotations. | To which are now added | an introductory essay, | and a | complete topical and textual index. | New York; | Published by Jonathan Leavitt | 182 Broadway. | Boston: Crocker & Brewster, | 47 Washington Street. | 1834

(p. 2.) Copyright.

(pp. 3–4) Notice, Recommendations, and Certificate.

(p. 5–8) Introductory Address.

458 pp. Sigs., 1–39.

The McNAMARA and CUMMINGS edition of 1816, which is referred to in a preceding page,[1] had been prepared in Ireland at a time of great politico-religious excitement, consequent on the efforts of the Catholics to secure constitutional emancipation from the civil and ecclesiastical disabilities, of which they had been the victims for centuries. This tardy act of justice was strenuously opposed throughout Great Britain and Ireland by a powerful and intolerant party in and out of Parliament, and every scheme was welcomed by it which seemed likely to result unfavorably to the just claims of an oppressed people. Itinerant preachers, some of them men of respectable attainments, were employed to arouse the latent loyalty of Irish Protestants. The contents of Catholic prayer books, the cases discussed in Dens' theology, the notes of the Rhemish New Testament, etc., were all ransacked for arguments to prove that the principles of the Catholic religion were dangerous to the State and irredeemably wicked. And as if to establish this conclusion out of the very mouths of those whose position called for its refutation, priests here and there

[1] p. 400.

were challenged to defend their creed publicly against those mercenary crusaders, who came prepared, so they said, to prove that creed a monstrous mass of superstition; and common Protestantism, with all its variations and contradictions, the religion of the Gospel. Rencontres between priests and preachers became quite common. All over Ireland public meetings were announced and held, at which the relative merits of the two religions were discussed, several of these discussions being considered of such importance that the speeches of the respective champions appeared in the local newspapers. In other cases the proceedings were published in book form. That was so in reference to the memorable discussion which took place in Dublin between Pope and Maguire in 1827, and lasted six days. It was also so, when in 1828, at Londonderry, an oral discussion was carried on, for six days also, between six Catholic clergymen on one side and an equal number of Protestant ministers on the other. Copies of the former discussion can easily be obtained. But those of the latter are exceedingly rare, as the book has been long since out of print. On such occasions, the champions of Protestantism rarely neglected to avail themselves of the annotations appended to the text of the original Rheims New Testament. Those annotations had been always objectionable to Irish and English Catholics, as they misrepresented their principles and had been, soon after they appeared, disavowed by them, although with the exception of its Latinisms no fault was found with the translation itself. But fortunately for the success of those ardent Protestants who were opposed to Catholic emancipation, McNamara and Cummings had published an edition of the Rheims New Testament with those original annotations, which had long ceased to appear in connection with that volume. That edition became at once one of the most serviceable weapons (so they

thought) in the hands of those who believed that bare toleration for their religion was the only privilege that could be safely granted to the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland

Irish Protestants are a good deal more hearty in their hatred of the Catholic religion, and much more unscrupulous in their use of means for opposing it, than English Protestants. The feelings of the former in this respect have been inherited by a large number of their descendants in the United States, where they contrive in some measure, to inoculate otherwise just and liberal neighbors with the virus that runs in their own veins. Opposed, like their fathers before them, to religious toleration, they seemed to have watched with considerable interest the progress of the struggle for liberty of conscience in Ireland and Great Britain, and no doubt were somewhat disappointed at the partial victory obtained there in 1829 by the advocates of equal civil and religious rights.

Hitherto there was nothing to indicate, that American Catholics would ever constitute more than a mere fraction of the population. They were too contemptible in number and influence to deserve notice, much less to excite opposition. But before the doors of the British Parliament were thrown open to Catholics, and the struggle for religious equality was thus more than half over in Ireland and Great Britain, a Catholic hierarchy composed of an Archbishop and eleven bishops had already been established in the United States; where, moreover, the increase of the Catholic population, of Catholic churches, of Catholic educational institutions, and of Catholic religious communities had been so sudden, so prodigious, as to excite alarm among those who believed, or pretended to think, that the growth of the Catholic Church in any country was dangerous to civil and religious liberty. There were persons who thought or said

so then. There are some who think or say so still, as if Christian civilization and Christian liberty were not the creation of the Catholic Church, or could be established or maintained on other principles than those which distinguish her teaching.

Well, it happened about the time when it was perceived that American Catholicity was likely to become an important factor in shaping the future of the Republic, that the political and religious controversies which grew out of the struggle for religious liberty in Ireland were still fresh in the minds of those ardent patriots, who believed that this is and should be a Protestant country, and that the spread of the Catholic religion should be placed under such restrictions as would relieve the minds of every loyal citizen from all apprehension regarding the safety of our free institutions. Something, therefore, according to the views which those devoted guardians of the Republic entertained, had to be done. It is unnecessary here, however, to state what shape that something did actually take. But it was to be expected, that some of the means resorted to in Ireland and England for resisting what was called Catholic aggression, would be adopted here. A regular fusillade from the Protestant press was opened along the whole line. Rev. John Breckenridge, a Presbyterian preacher, as the champion of conglomerate Protestantism, challenged the then Rev. John Hughes. A written discussion followed in 1830, which was kept up for some time in the public papers, and at last led, in 1834, to an oral controversy between the two, in Philadelphia. The West caught the contagion, and the Purcell and Campbell controversy in 1837, with others of less note, East and West, followed. In fact, there were few large cities throughout the Union where an effort was not made to excite hostility to the Catholic Church, by appealing to the passions and prejudices of the masses. In the Irish

campaign against Catholic emancipation, the opponents of that measure had made good use of the original Rheims New Testament, and why should not their friends on this side of the Atlantic avail themselves of the same weapon in pushing forward the unholy crusade in which they were engaged. An edition, therefore, of this New Testament, with its original objectionable annotations, appeared at New York, under Protestant auspices, in the year 1834; although the leaders of the enterprise must have been well aware that Bishop Doyle, who died in that year, while under oath, and representing the sentiments of the Irish hierarchy before a committee of the House of Lords, declared, when asked, "You consider yourselves pledged to all matters contained in these notes?" "No, not by any means; on the contrary, there were notes affixed, I believe, to the Rhemish Testament, which were most objectionable; and, on being presented to us, we caused them to be expunged."

As stated in a preceding page, this American Protestant edition of the Rhemish New Testament, besides the text and notes, contained some fresh matter, for which it was indebted to the industry of the zealous gentlemen who were the first as well as the last to introduce it to American readers. This extraneous matter consisted principally of a notice, recommendations, certificate, and introductory address. The notice and recommendations bear the signatures of over a hundred Protestant clergymen. The certificate is signed "John Breckenridge; William C. Brownlee, D.D.; Thomas De Witt, D.D.; Duncan Dunbar; Archibald Maclay; William Patton"—and declares, "after examination we do hereby certify that the present reprint is an exact and faithful copy of the original work, without abridgment or addition, except that the Latin of a few phrases, which were translated by the annotators, and some unimpor-

tant expletive words, were undesignedly omitted." As the edition was intended not to edify, but to insult Catholics, and foster the unkind feelings with which they were regarded at the time by not a few of their fellow-citizens, its reverend sponsors hesitate not to use such opprobrious language as *Papists*, *Popish*, *Romish*, and *Romanists*, when referring to the Church, her doctrines, or her members. Nor were they any way loath, when introducing that edition, to substitute fiction for fact, or to impose on the credulity of their readers by positive statements regarding matters about which they themselves, judged by those statements, knew as little as those in whose interest or for whose gratification they wrote. Thus they speak of the English College at Rheims as a Jesuit College, and the writers of the English translation of the Vulgate New Testament prepared at Rheims as Jesuits, whereas the Jesuits had nothing to do with that College or that translation. The former was conducted and the latter written by English secular priests connected neither with the Jesuits nor any other religious order. The word *Jesuit*, however, was a handy one under the circumstances. For, at the time it was as serviceable among anti-Romanists as *bugbear* among the timid inmates of the nursery at all times. In the introductory address, which brought the veritable Rheims New Testament and its awful notes to the knowledge of the American Protestant public, the reference to the McNamara Bible was also quite misleading, and the reader left in ignorance of the fact that that edition, which at the time of the struggle for Catholic emancipation furnished a useful topic for inflaming the public mind, was started as a speculation by a Catholic book-seller and a Protestant printer; and on the failure of the former was completed by the latter, who, according to Archdeacon Cotton, sent most of the copies to America. Drawing on the inexhaustible resources of

their own imagination, the writers of the introduction further inform the American Protestant public, that only mutilated Bibles were permitted to be published and sold among Catholics in this country, while European copies were constantly imported and privately sold to the initiated only, who had to obtain an order for that purpose from the vicar-generals of the different dioceses. In no diocese was there ever such a rule or custom, and no man, Catholic or Protestant, here or elsewhere, has ever seen a mutilated English Bible, except mutilated copies of the one "translated out of the original tongues by his Majesty's special command," such mutilated copies being often put in circulation here among those English speaking non-Catholics who profess some one of the creeds manufactured in the sixteenth and following centuries, or profess no creed in particular. The American Protestant edition of the Rheims New Testament, like the McNamara Bible, was probably a failure. Though stereotyped, no doubt in anticipation of an immense sale, it was never reprinted, and, like many other productions of polemical rancor, has long since sunk into utter oblivion.

Lucas's Octavo Bible,—1837, published by Fielding Lucas, Baltimore, and containing annotations of Dr. Challoner, was a reprint of Dr. Troy's Bible of 1791. It had the approbation of the Provincial Council, consisting of the Archbishop of Baltimore and nine bishops.

Cummiskey's Duodecimo New Testament,—1840, was published at Philadelphia, by Eugene Cummiskey, with the approbation of the Right Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick, and the Right Rev. John Hughes. The text is from Murray's 1825.

Sadlier's Duodecimo New Testament,—1842, published by D. & J. Sadlier, New York, is from the plates of the Devereux edition, Utica. It has the approbation of Dr. Dubois; later editions have that of Dr. Hughes.

DUNIGAN'S OCTAVO BIBLE,—1844, was published at New York by Edward Dunigan, with the approbation of the Right Rev. John Hughes, Bishop of New York. It contains several steel plates, illustrative of scriptural scenes and personages. It is from the last London and Dublin editions, the plates used being those of Doyle's octavo of 1833.

SADLIER'S QUARTO BIBLE,—1845, published by D. & J. Sadlier, New York, with the approbation of the Right Rev. Bishop Hughes. It is revised and corrected according to the Clementine edition of the Vulgate, contains Dr. Challoner's annotations, with Ward's *Errata*, and is a verbatim reprint of Cummiskey's quarto of 1824. It is embellished with a number of steel engravings. Later editions have the approbation of Archbishops Hughes, Kenrick, Purcell, and Bishops John McCloskey, Fitzpatrick, Timon.

DUNIGAN'S 18MO NEW TESTAMENT,—1845, published by Edward Dunigan, New York, and approved by the Most Rev. John Hughes, Archbishop of New York. It was printed from the plates of a Belfast edition. Subsequent impressions were made by Edward Dunigan & Brother.

HEWETT'S ILLUSTRATED OCTAVO NEW TESTAMENT, 1848–50, from the Latin Vulgate, and diligently compared with the original Greek.—This edition was illuminated after original designs by W. H. Hewett, Esq., New York; Hewett & Spooner, 106 Liberty Street; John J. Reed, Printer, 16 Spruce Street. It received a flattering approval from Right Rev. John Hughes, Bishop of New York, and recommendations from Archbishop Eccleston, Baltimore; Bishops Kenrick, Rappe, Blanc, Reynolds, Whelan. It does not follow the Rheims version or Challoner's revision of that version. It was edited by Rev. James McMahon, and conforms to the division of verses in the Clementine edition of the

Vulgate. The editor availed himself of the Greek, and of the light which Hebrew throws on the Hebraisms in St. Paul.

KENRICK'S FOUR GOSPELS,—published by Edward Dunigan & Brother, 1849, New York. This edition, translated from the Latin Vulgate, and diligently compared with the original Greek text, was intended as a revision of the Rhemish translation by the Right Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick, Bishop of Philadelphia, afterwards Archbishop of Baltimore. The learned prelate has enhanced the value of this revision by copious notes, critical and explanatory, and a map of Palestine.

TALLIS'S FOLIO BIBLE,—1850, was never completed. It was undertaken by the house of Tallis, Willoughby & Co., London and New York, and entitled "The Holy Bible, translated from the Latin Vulgate, diligently compared with the Hebrew and the Greek, and other editions in various languages. . . . The whole revised by the Rev. Geo. L. Haydock, V. G." It is also stated that this edition is recommended to the Catholic community by the Archbishop of New York. It was designed as a reprint of Dr. Hamill's edition, which appeared in Dublin in 1822.

KENRICK'S—edition of the Acts of the Apostles, Epistles of St. Paul, the Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse, with notes critical and explanatory, published by Edward Dunigan & Brother, New York, 1851. This is a revision of the Rhemish translation by Rt. Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick, then Bishop of Philadelphia, and contains in front of the title page a map of the countries travelled by the Apostles.

KENRICK'S—edition of the Psalms, Book of Wisdom, and Canticle of Canticles, with notes critical and explanatory, published by Lucas Brothers, Baltimore, 1857. This is a revised and corrected edition of the Douay version, by Dr. Kenrick when archbishop of Baltimore.

KENRICK'S—edition of the Book of Job and the Prophets, with notes critical and explanatory, published by Kelly, Hedian & Piet, Baltimore, 1859, being a revised edition of the Douay version by Dr. Kenrick, Archbishop of Baltimore.

KENRICK'S—edition of the Pentateuch with notes critical and explanatory, published by Kelly, Hedian & Piet, Baltimore, 1860. This edition is also by the Archbishop of Baltimore, having been translated from the Vulgate and diligently compared with the original text, and is a revision of the Douay version.

KENRICK'S—edition of the Historical Books of the Old Testament, with notes critical and explanatory, published by Kelly, Hedian & Piet, Baltimore, 1860. This has been derived by the same undefatigable prelate from the same sources as the preceding, and like it is a revision of the Douay version.

KENRICK'S—second edition of his New Testament, with notes critical and explanatory; published by Kelly, Hedian & Piet, Baltimore, 1862. This, as stated, is a revised and corrected edition of the one already issued by Archbishop Kenrick, and which consisted of two volumes, the first published in 1849, the second in 1851.

Archbishop Kenrick's revision of the Douay and Rheims version of the Vulgate is a very valuable contribution to Biblical literature. Its style is pure, simple, and dignified, and the notes with which it is enriched are judicious, learned, and instructive.

SHEA'S POCKET BIBLE,—published by D. & J. Sadlier, New York, 1871. This edition was the work of the distinguished scholar John Gilmary Shea, LL.D., who, in preparing it, followed Challoner's original edition of 1750, correcting only manifest misprints and supplying omissions. Mr. Shea compared his edition three times with the Latin text, the last collation being completed after the plates were cast, when, unfortunately, his proofs

were destroyed by a fire which occurred in the printing-office. The most serious misprints and omissions were, however, carefully attended to subsequently.

Besides the English American editions of the Sacred Scripture enumerated already, others in various foreign languages were also published in the United States under Catholic auspices. Thus—

An edition of De Sacy's French translation of the Vulgate New Testament, printed by J. T. Buckingham and approved by "John, Bishop of Boston," appeared in Boston in 1810, with the title: "Le Nouveau Testament de Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ en Français sur la Vulgate; traduction de L. M. de Sacy. Revue sur les meilleures éditions, vol. I. or II., Boston: De l'imprimerie de J. T. Buckingham, 1810.

Sadlier's German Bible, 1850.—This was a stereotyped edition of Allioli's German version of the Vulgate. It had the approbation of Bishop Hughes, but contained only extracts from the notes appended to the text by the translator. Its title was: "Die Heilige Schrift übersetzt aus dem Lateinischen Urtext. Mit der Genehmigung des Rt. Rev. Dr. Hughes, Bischof von New York. Engraving, Johannes der Täufer. New York, D. & J. Sadlier.

Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testamentes.—Aus der Vulgata mit Bezug auf den Grundtext neu übersetzt, von Dr. Joseph Franz Allioli, mit einer Auswahl seiner Anmerkungen. Herausgegeben von einem Priester der Versammlung des allerheiligsten Erlösers, mit Gutheissung und Approbation des Hochwürdigsten Bischofs von New York, Dr. Johannes Hughes. New York: D. & J. Sadlier, No. 58 Gold-Strasse; Boston: No. 72 Federal Strasse. Stereotypie und Druck von H. Ludwig & Comp., No. 70 Vesey Strasse. 1850.

Die Heilige Schrift des Neuen Testamentes.—Aus der Vulgata mit Bezug auf den Grundtext neu über-

setzt, von Dr. Joseph Franz Allioli, mit einer Auswahl seiner Anmerkungen. Herausgegeben von einem Priester der Versammlung des allerheiligsten Erlösers, mit Gutheissung und Approbation des Hochwürdigsten Bischofs von New York, Dr. Johannes Hughes. Zu haben bei D. & J. Sadlier, 149 William-Strasse, 1852.

DUNIGAN'S SPANISH TESTAMENT, 1853,—El Nuevo Testamento de Nuestro Señor y Salvador Jesu-Christo, nuevamente traducido de la Vulgata latina al español, aclarado el sentido de algunas lugares, con la luz que dan los textos originales hebreo y griego é illustrado con varias notas, sacados de los santos padres y expositores, sagrados, por el exmo. Sr. Dn. Felix Torres Amat, obispo de Astorga. Lleva añadidas algunas notas tomadas del P. Scio y otros calificados interpretes, con la aprobacion del illmo. fr. Jose S. Alemany, obispo de Monterey, California. Primera edicion conforme a la segunda del obispo Amat. Cut Nueva York: Eduardo Dunigan y hermano, Calle de Fulton, No. 151. 1853. This edition was prepared by the then Bishop of Monterey, Rt. Rev. Joseph Sadoc Alemany, afterwards archbishop of San Francisco, who added many new notes to it.

Coincidently with the efforts made to supply all the faithful throughout the country with a genuine version of the Vulgate intelligible to each one, the American Bible Society, as a means of promoting the object of its organization, engaged also in the publication of versions of the Vulgate originally prepared and approved by episcopal sanction for the use of Catholics living on the continent of Europe. The American editions of those versions brought out by the Society were of course modified so as to promote to the utmost its principles, without exactly exciting the suspicion of those for whose enlightenment they were intended. There was, for example—

The American Bible Society's Spanish New Testa-

ment, 1819. This was an edition of Scio's Spanish translation of the Vulgate New Testament. It was printed in New York, without notes, its title-page presenting the following contents artistically arranged :—

"El Nuevo Testamento de Nuestro Señor Jesu Cristo, traducido de la Biblia Vulgata Latina en Español por el rmo. P. Felipe Scio de S. Miguel, obispo electo de Segovia. Reimpreso literal y diligentemente conforme a la segunda edicion hecha en Madrid, ano de 1797. Revista y corregida por su mismo traductor. Jesus les dixo : *Errais, no sabiendo las Escrituras.* S. Mat. cap., xxii., v., 29. Nueva York : Edicion estereotipa, por Elihu White. A costa de la Sociedad Americana de la Biblia, ano de 1819.

There was the Spanish Catholic Bible, issued in New York by the Protestant American Bible Society, in the year 1824. It was an edition of the Spanish translation made by Don Felipe Scio de San Miguel from the Vulgate, and printed at Madrid in 1794. In the American edition the notes were omitted. Its title was "La Biblica Sagrada a saber : el antiguo y el nuevo Testamento, traducidos de la Vulgata Latina en Español por el rmo. P. Felipe Scio de S. Miguel, obispo electo de Segovia. Nueva edicion, a costa de la Sociedad Americana de la Biblia, conforme a la segunda, que revista y corregida publico su mismo traductor el ano de 1797 en Madrid. Jesus respondio : Escudriñad las Escrituras. S. Juan. cap. v., ver. 39. Nueva York : Edicion estereotipica por A. Chandler, 1824. "El Nuevo Testamento, traducido de la Vulgate Latina en Español, por el rmo. P. Felipe Scio de S. Miguel, de los escuelas pias, obispo electo de Segovia. Nueva edicion, a costa de la Sociedad Americana de la Biblia, quen la ha hecho cotejar con la que revista y corregida publico su traductor el ano de 1797, en Madrid. Nueva York ; Edicion estereotipica por A. Chandler, 1824.

The aforesaid Society also published without notes at New York in 1837 a 32mo edition of Scio's New Testament with this title page :—

"El Nuevo Testamento, traducido al Español por el R. P. Felipe Scio de S. Miguel, de las Escuelas Pias, obispo de Segovia. Nueva York: Edicion estereotipica por F. F. Ripley. A costa de la Sociedad Americana de la Biblia, Formada en Nueva York, A. D. 1816. Imprinta de D. Fanshaw. 1837."

In 1838 the same Society had printed without notes in New York a 32mo. edition of De Sacy's New Testament with the following title page :—

"Le Nouveau Testament de notre Seigneur Jésus Christ; traduit sur la Vulgate par le Maistre de Sacy. New York: Stereotype par F. F. Ripley, pour la Société Biblique Americaine, établie en MDCCCXVI. 1838. D. F. Fanshaw, Imprimeur."

A Portuguese 12mo New Testament, without notes, made its appearance in 1839, under the auspices of the aforesaid Society. It was an edition of Antonio Pereira's translation of the Vulgate printed at Lisbon in 1781–83, and had the following title page :—

"O Novo Testamento de Nosso Senhor Jesu Christo, tradusido em Portuguez segundo o Vulgata, pelo Padre Antonio Pereira de Figueiredo, Nova York: Ediçao estereotipica por J. S. Redfield, a costa da Sociedade Americana da Biblia formada em Nova York, A. D. 1816. Impressa per D. Fanshaw, 1839.

The publication and distribution of these mutilated and falsified Catholic versions of the Holy Scripture is such an infamous business, that it can hardly be conceived how intelligent and honorable men can be so far deluded as to furnish funds for the purpose, though one can easily understand why those to whom it is a source of profit—publishers, printers, booksellers, book-agents, etc., should engage in it. For these Bibles and Testa-

ments, stripped of their notes and otherwise mutilated as they generally are, are simply base counterfeits of originals which have been carefully and conscientiously prepared for those who believe them to be the Word of God, and who consign these counterfeits to the fate that awaits waste paper, the moment they perceive their real character. This disreputable business, however, was long carried on in the same disreputable way in Europe as in the United States; Italy, France, Spain, and Poland in particular, can bear testimony to the dishonest and dishonorable methods of those engaged in it. Diodati's Calvinistic Italian and French translations were everywhere insolently thrust upon Catholics, and when these false versions proved to be an obstacle to the schemes of the propagandists, these worthies, in order to convince their employers that there was still reason to hope for success, undertook the distribution of Catholic versions, after so deftly inoculating them with their own errors, that ordinary readers would fail to detect the despicable fraud. This plan was worked for a while in Italy. And in this way France was flooded with counterfeits of De Sacy's version, Spain with counterfeits of Scio's, and Poland with counterfeits of Wiecki's. Probably the boldest, most fraudulent, and most disgraceful attempt of the kind was perpetrated some years ago in New York. The case is so unique, and the details so curious and so well established, as to deserve a separate paragraph.

Year 1890, in the county where these remarks are written, a priest on one of his visits to a Catholic family had his attention directed to a quarto Bible, beautifully bound and highly embellished with numerous plates, but was told it was a counterfeit. This he could not believe until he had carefully examined the book, when he was convinced that it was a Lutheran Bible. He then asked and obtained it as a gift from the gentleman in whose

possession it was. And, of course,—burned it? Not at all. It is now placed beside that other faithful German version prepared by the learned Dr. Joseph Francis Von Allioli, and will probably remain there as a standing monument of the unscrupulous methods resorted to for the dissemination of the Protestant Scriptures. The contents of its title-page are:—

"Die Heilige Schrift des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Aus der Vulgata uebersetzt von Dr. Joseph Franz von Allioli. Illustrirte Handausgabe, enthaltend den vom Apostolischen Stuhle approbirten vollständigen Text und eine aus den Anmerkungen des grösseren Allioli-schen Bibelwerkes von dem Verfasser selbstbesorgte abgekürzte Erläuterung jenes Textes. Mit Approbation des hochw. bischöfl. Ordinariates Augsburg und mit Empfehlung der hochwürdigsten Ordinariate von Breslau, Olmütz, Wien, Gran und Ofen, Salzburg, Freiburg, Brixen, Paderborn.

1866.

Druck und Verlag von Friedrich Pustet in New-York, 61 Liberty Street, nahe Broadway."

On the opposite side of the title-page is the following:

"Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1866 by Fr. Pustet in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, for the Southern District of New York."

After Malachias, the deutero books and *Addenda* of Esther and Daniel, with the Prayer of Manasses, are thus introduced.

"Apocrypha."

Das sind Bücher, so der heiligen Schrift nicht gleich gehalten, und doch nützlich und gut zu lesen sind."

The book was submitted to the well-known Publishers from whose house it professes to have issued, and elicited the following answer:—

"The title of the Old Testament is *pasted* in—the paper of the Old Testament is different from the paper of title page. It is possible that the man who imported the Bible got an order for a Catholic Bible; then he ordered from us the first number (for our Bible can be had in 24 numbers) and *pasted* the title page in the book. . . . This Bible is a fraud by all means." How many such frauds have been committed in the name of religion, is known only to the agents themselves and to Him from Whom nothing is concealed.

In the United States there have been also several unsuccessful attempts made at different times by Catholic publishers to bring out entire or partial editions of the Scripture. In some such cases the publishers, after issuing a few sheets, abandoned the undertaking. In others the undertaking, after having been announced, was never commenced. Separate books of the Bible have also occasionally been published, or selected as bases of commentaries by ecclesiastics, but without episcopal sanction. Various editions of the Epistles and Gospels prescribed for Sundays and Festivals throughout the year have, besides, been issued from the Catholic press.

The publication and sale of Catholic Bibles in the United States constitute such a profitable business, that even Protestant publishers have been tempted to embark in it, and Catholic Old or New Testaments, or both combined, may be obtained at a moderate price at almost any book store, especially in the larger cities throughout the country. The stock on hand is generally renewed by the reproduction of some popular domestic or imported edition or revision of the Douay and Rheims version of the Vulgate. Thus a New York house proposes to issue this year an edition of Denver's Douay Bible, which first appeared at Belfast in 1839, and engages to sell it for $1.25 per copy. Another New York publisher is certain that from 1868 to

[1] 1890.

1888 he has sold 138,250 of Haydock and Challoner Bibles, and believes that, were he to add 25,000 more, he would not be unduly exaggerating the amount of his sales. Of those sales 41,000 were Haydock's Bibles, and 97,250 Challoner's, that is, the Old and New Testament in one volume. His smallest sales were in 1868, when they numbered 1000; his largest sales being in 1885, when they amounted to 14,000.

CHAPTER XXIX.

WHAT THE CHURCH HAS DONE FOR THE DISSEMINATION OF THE SCRIPTURES IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE SINCE THE INVENTION OF THE PRINTING PRESS, SHE HAS ALSO DONE DURING THE SAME PERIOD FOR THEIR DISSEMINATION IN ALL OTHER LANGUAGES SPOKEN BY CHRISTIAN NATIONS.

It must not be supposed that any of the editions of the Anglo-Catholic Bible already enumerated, or, indeed, any version of the Sacred Scripture into any modern language, has ever received the supreme sanction of the Church. That honor is reserved exclusively for one translation—the Latin Vulgate. The most that any other Bible can expect is simply tacit recognition on the part of the Church; and those concerned in its publication have reason to be grateful when the Chief Pastor, or one of his officials in his name, extends, as is sometimes the case, a word of blessing or commendation of the labors in which they are engaged. Yet the Popes have at all times encouraged any honest effort to disseminate the Scriptures entire and uncorrupt in the vernacular of every country. This is proved by the approbation which bishops everywhere, with the knowledge and consent of the Pope, give to translations intended for the use of the laity. In fact, the language used by some of the Popes on this subject has been so direct and emphatic, that none but those outside the pale of reason would assert the contrary. Thus, when the Most Rev. Anthony Martini, Archbishop of Florence, translated the

Scriptures into Italian, Pius VI., who was then Pope, in a well-known letter dated Rome, April 1, 1778, addressed him in these words: "You judge exceedingly well, that the faithful should be excited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures; for these are the most abundant sources, *which ought to be left open to every one*, to draw from them purity of morals and doctrine, to eradicate the errors which are widely disseminated in these corrupt times. This you have seasonably effected, as you declare, by publishing the sacred writings *in the language of your country, suitable to every one's capacity.*" Brian Walton, Anglican bishop of Chester, in the preface to his Polyglot Bible, has inserted a document which establishes the same point. It is a letter addressed to the King of Spain by Gregory XIII., who was Pope from 1572 to 1585. "The advantages to be derived from the Scriptures (says the Pontiff) are vere great; for as regards theology, which is the highest philosophy, all the mysteries of our holy religion, and of the divinity, are unfolded in these books; and as regards the parts which are styled moral, all precepts directed to all virtues are gathered from it: in which two branches the whole sum of our salvation and happiness is contained, so that nothing can be more *becoming* than the reading of these books, nothing more *advantageous*, nothing *better suited to every class*, nothing more replete with wisdom and learning."

Yet, with the exception of the Vulgate, neither the Church nor her chief Pastor, speaking as her infallible mouthpiece, has ever sanctioned any copy or version of the Bible, no matter by whom made. Individual bishops may and do approve of particular versions or editions. But nobody besides themselves is responsible for the approbation thus given, or the use which they allow translators and publishers to make of it. There have been generally very few occasions on which such privilege has been abused. Yet the occurrence of typo-

graphical errors, objectionable notes, and even changes in the text, arising from want of due care on the part of editors and publishers in one or two instances,[1] show that episcopal sanction cannot always prevent even serious defects. In the first Provincial Council of Baltimore, 1829, a decree was framed for retaining the Douay version, as one that had been approved by the Holy See. The Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, however, directed that the part of the decree implying that the Douay version had ever been approved by the Holy See should be expunged, as a most diligent investigation had failed to discover any record of such approval.[2] "The decree itself, as resting on the constant usage of the churches in which the English language prevails, was sanctioned, with the addition made by the prelates, that a most accurate edition should be published."[3] This action of the Sacred Congregation shows that, while the Church declines to approve any version besides the Vulgate, she is ready to encourage any enterprise that proposes to provide the laity with faithful translations in languages which they understand. But her policy of withholding her formal sanction from such translations is sufficiently justified by the difficulty of clothing with another form of speech the true sense of what is contained in that Bible, which she has adopted as a standard of written revelation; as well as by the constant changes from which no living language is exempt. Hence the Sacred Congregation in its "Instruction" regarding the decrees passed at the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866, while recommending a revision of the Douay Bible, and suggesting the measures to be adopted for that purpose, is careful to

[1] Vide Kenrick's *General Introduction to N. Test.*, p. vi.

[2] *Conc. Prov. Balt.* I., 60, 61.

[3] Kenrick's *General Introd. to Psalms, B. of Wisd., Cant. of Cant.*, pp. IX., X.

observe that the Holy See is averse to confirming versions of the kind with its approbation. [1]

Yet, ever since the invention of the printing press, which preceded the birth of Luther by almost half a century, the Church, through her hierarchy, has to the utmost availed herself of that means for supplying every Christian country with the Scriptures in its own language. But in relation to this point, our list of facts must be condensed, and our remarks be necessarily brief, in view of the amount of space just devoted to that part of the general subject which refers to what is of most importance to our readers—the circulation of the Bible in the English language.

To begin with *Germany*.—There was printed in 1466 a German translation of the Latin Vulgate. Two copies of this translation are extant. It was republished with improvements at least sixteen times before the appearance of Luther's, in 1534. In that year another version of the Vulgate in German was published by John Dietemberger, at Metz, under the auspices of Albert, Archbishop and Elector of that city. Within a hundred years after it was printed, it was republished upwards of twenty times. The year 1537 witnessed the appearance of the third German Catholic translation, by Emser and Eck, the two distinguished divines who had triumphantly championed the cause of truth against the errors of Luther. It was reprinted several times, and was followed in the year 1630 by another, from the pen of Gaspar Ulenberg, dedicated to Ferdinand, Archbishop and Elector of Cologne. Since then Catholic Germany has repeatedly availed itself of the printing press for the purpose of disseminating the Sacred Scriptures among the people. In the present century several German Catholic Bibles, deserving of special mention, have been published, as Schwarzel's, Brentano's, Allioli's, etc.

[1] *Conc. Plen. Balt.* II., p. cxxxviii.

France also, since the printing press had so greatly facilitated the publication of books, has been frequently favored with Catholic translations of the Bible in its own language. In 1478, according to Usher, Guiars Des Moulin's "Bible Historyale" an almost complete French translation, appeared. A new edition of it, corrected and enlarged by John de Rely, subsequently Bishop of Angers, was published in 1487, and republished several times afterward. In 1512 Le Fevre completed another French Catholic version, which passed through many editions. A revision of it by the divines of Louvain was printed in 1550, and was afterwards reprinted thirty-nine times before the year 1700. Yet these were not the only revisions made for the use of French Catholics; for, were we to continue the list, we should have to name several others, as De Sacy's, Corbin's, Amellote's, Maralles', Godeau's, Hure's, etc.

Italy, at an early period, took advantage of the facilities presented by the printing press for providing her people with the Word of God in their own language. For, the translation of Nicholas Malerni, a Camaldolese monk, was printed both at Rome and Venice in 1471, just twelve years before Luther saw the light, and sixty-three before he translated the Bible into German. Malerni's version was from the Vulgate, and before 1525 passed through as many as thirteen editions, all of which were issued *with the leave of the Inquisition.* It was followed in 1532 by Bruccioli's Italian Bible, which was a translation of the Latin version made in 1528 by Sanctes Pagninus from the Hebrew of the Old Testament and the Greek of the New. Bruccioli's translation was revised by Santes Marmochini, and having thus become practically a new version, it was published in 1538, and again in 1546, and a third time in 1547. Of all these Italian translations the most accurate is one already mentioned in a preceding page, that made with

the commendation of Pope Pius VI. by Anthony Martini, Archbishop of Florence. The Old Testament of this version was published in 1769, and the New in 1779. Both have been repeatedly published since.

Spain, like every other Catholic country, lost no time in turning to account the means presented by the printing press for a cheap and rapid distribution of the Scriptures among her people in their own vernacular. A version of the whole Bible already made in the Valencian dialect by Boniface, brother of St. Vincent Ferrer, or, as some suppose, by the Saint himself, was therefore printed at Valencia in 1578, *with the formal sanction of the Inquisition*. It seems to have been reprinted about 1515. A volume containing a translation of the Epistles and Gospels, by Ambrosio de Montesina, appeared in 1512, and was republished at Antwerp in 1544, at Barcelona in 1601 and 1608, and at Madrid in 1603 and 1615. Subsequently, translations of the Proverbs, Psalms, and other books were printed. And in 1794 Don Felipe Scio de San Miguel, afterwards Bishop of Segovia, printed at Madrid a translation of the Vulgate, enriching it with copious notes. In 1823, another version, prepared by F. T. Amat, and accompanied by a commentary, was published at Madrid.

Portugal was provided with a Catholic Bible in its own language late in the last century. It was the work of Antonio Pereira de Figueiredo, and was printed at Lisbon, 1784. Long before that, however, the Scriptures, as we shall see, had been translated into Portuguese.

Flanders, at the time Guttenberg's great invention became known, had an old Flemish translation of the Bible in manuscript, made, according to Usher, before the year 1210 by "one named Jacobus Merland." Of that manuscript some copies still survive. It was printed at Cologne in 1475, and passed through several

editions before Luther's translation appeared. Two distinct editions of it were published at Delft in 1477, a third at Goude in 1479, and four others at Antwerp in 1515, 1525, 1526, 1528. The last of these editions, the most correct of all, was reprinted eight times in the space of seventeen years, and was published at Louvain in 1548, with improvements by Nicholas Von Wingh. The New Testament, translated by Cornelius Hendricks, was published separately at Delft, in 1524. At least ten editions of it seem to have been brought out within thirty years at Antwerp alone. In the following century several new versions of the entire Bible appeared in Flemish, as those of De Witt, Laemput, Schurr, etc. To these should be added one almost completed by William Smetz and Peter Van Howe, O.S.F., a New Testament left unfinished by S. Lipman, and another part of the entire Bible, being the poetical books of the Old Testament together with the New, a work approved by the Belgian Bishops, and undertaken by Theodore Beelen, Professor of Louvain, whom death prevented from accomplishing his task.

Poland had a version prepared for the use of its people by James Wujek, S. J., who translated the Old and New Testament from the Vulgate into Polish. It was printed at Warsaw in 1599,[1] at the expense of Stanislaus Karnkowski, Primate of Poland and Archbishop of Gnesen, but seems to have been printed for the first time at Cracow in 1561, and again in 1577, and finally in 1619, and always *with the approbation of the reigning Pontiffs.*

Bohemia. In 1488 a Bohemian version of the entire Bible was published at Prague. It was afterwards published at Cutna in 1498, and at Venice in 1506 and 1511.

Slavonia. A Slavonic version, comprising a great

[1] A copy of this edition has been found among the Poles in the United States.

portion of the Bible, was printed at Cracow in the beginning of the sixteenth century.

Hungary. In 1533, a Hungarian version of St. Paul's Epistles by B. Komjathy was published at Cracow. In 1536, a Hungarian version of the four Gospels by Gabriel Ponnonius Pothinus was printed at Posen. In 1541, the entire New Testament in the Hungarian language by John Silvester issued from the press at Ujszigethini. In the latter part of the sixteenth century Stephen Arator, S.J., having collated the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin texts, is reported to have written a Hungarian translation of the entire Bible, but it was never printed. Another version, which was received with great favor by the Catholics of Hungary, was executed by George Kaldi, S.J., in the early part of the seventeenth century, and printed at Vienna in 1626. Several editions of this version have since appeared, some as late as 1862, if not later. The version was made from the Latin Vulgate.

To the foregoing list should be added, as they indicate the sincere purpose of the Church to secure the widest possible circulation of the Scriptures in the East as well as the West, several editions of the Bible, translated into Syriac and Arabic as well as some of the dialects of Egypt, and printed at Rome, Venice, and Vienna for the use of the Oriental Christians; and an Ethiopic version of the Bible published at Rome in 1848, together with many excellent editions of the Armenian Bible, issued from the press of the Armenian Monks at San Lazaro, one of the Venetian islands.[1]

The same efforts which we have seen the Church put forth during the last four centuries to place the Sacred

[1] On the subject of printed versions other than English, the principal works consulted have been Le Long's *Bibliotheca Sacra;* Kitto's *Cyclopedia* ("Versions); *Dublin Review*, vol. I.; Dixon's *Introd.*, vol. I.; Cornely's *Introd.*, vol. I.; and Danko's *Introd.*, vol. I.

Scriptures within reach of all in the Old World, were witnessed in the New, as soon as it was opened to the zeal of her missionaries. Even Protestant writers bear testimony to this fact. Thus Thomas Hartwell Horne, D.D., an English divine, who died in 1862, and grudgingly recognizes any good feature in the policy of the Church, admits,[1] that Benedict Fernandez, a Dominican friar and vicar of Mixteca, in New Spain, translated the Epistles and Gospels into the Indian language spoken in that province; that Didacus de S. Maria, another Dominican friar, and vicar of the province of Mexico, who died in 1579, also translated the same portions of the New Testament into the Mexican tongue or general language of the country; that Louis Rodriguez, a Franciscan friar, translated into the same language the Proverbs of Solomon, and other fragments of Scripture; and that Arnoldo Basacio, also a Franciscan friar, translated into the idiom of the Western Indians the Epistles and Gospels appointed to be read for the whole year. Undoubtedly the writer, who has called the attention of English Protestant readers to these facts, would have had far more to say to the credit of the Dominican and Franciscan Fathers, as well as other Catholic missionaries who labored in the same field, had it not been that their efforts in rendering the Sacred Scriptures accessible to the Indians were in many instances thwarted by the civil authorities, and seriously impeded by the difficulties arising from the great variety of idioms among the native tribes of the New World. For the spirit by which the missionaries were actuated was that which had all along preserved the Scriptures entire, and had already propagated them throughout every part of the civilized world in languages which rendered them, in a manner, intelligible to any one who was able to read.

[1] *Appendix to Introd.*, vol. II., p. 120.

It is therefore evident that, since the printing press was invented, or at least since it was improved to such a degree as to render the publication of books a speedy, exact, and inexpensive operation as compared with the old method employed for the same purpose, the Church has done all that it was possible for her to do in supplying the laity with the word of God, by means of versions in the different languages spoken throughout the Christian world. And for the first five centuries after she commenced her divine mission, as a consequence of her approval, her blessing, and even her instructions, the Greek and Latin versions of the Bible, after having been diligently corrected, had been copied again and again by innumerable hands. In fact, from age to age many of the secular clergy, and great numbers of those who, under a rule approved by the Church, sought in her monasteries a safe retreat from the dangers of the world, consecrated their lives to the labor of illuminating, expounding, or transcribing the Sacred Scriptures. And it is to the patient industry of these devoted men ("lazy monks," you know) [1] that the present generation is indebted for most if not all of those early manuscript copies of the Bible, which still withstand the wear and tear incidental to all the works of man. Thus it could not be a difficult matter for any one living within the Roman Empire, when Latin and Greek were very generally understood, to procure such a copy of the Scriptures as he, if educated, could understand; while in those countries where a different language was spoken, as Syria, Egypt, Ethiopia, Arabia, Armenia, Persia, Slavonia, etc., versions of the Septuagint or Vulgate were (it is well

[1] Such of our separated brethren as know not the profound ignorance and absolute inertia that prevailed long ago among the inmates of monastic institutions had better read what has been written in 1845, "*On the Dark Ages*, by Rev. S. R. Maitland, D.D., F.R.S., and F.S.A., Librarian to his Grace, the (Protestant) Archbishop of Canterbury," England.

known) under the benign influence of the Church made for the use of the inhabitants, almost as soon as they became Christians. But as, with the irruptions of the Barbarians into the Roman Empire in the fifth and following centuries, all institutions of learning were crushed under the merciless tread of those rude invaders, half pagan, half Christian, Western Christendom, which they principally ravaged and afterwards occupied, might, when compared with its present condition, be regarded as more or less uncivilized and uneducated until probably the fourteenth century, when through the agencies employed by the Church order was brought out of chaos, human society at last reconstructed on an enduring basis, and the language of each people adapted to the creation of a national literature. Until that stage of progress had been reached, it was neither necessary nor possible for the Church to adopt such measures as would place in the hands of every one a copy of the Scriptures which he could understand; though it is certain, as we shall see, that even then all classes or Christians had it in their power to become familiar with, at least, the leading doctrinal and moral principles contained in the Scriptures.

CHAPTER XXX.

BEFORE THE INVENTION OF THE PRINTING PRESS, VARIOUS CAUSES CONTRIBUTED TO RESTRICT THE CIRCULATION OF THE BIBLE. ITS EXISTENCE AND ITS CONTENTS, HOWEVER, THROUGH THE INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH, WERE SO FAMILIAR TO ALL, THAT AT NO TIME COULD IT BE CALLED AN UNKNOWN BOOK.

First, then, it was not necessary for the Church to provide every one with a copy of the Scriptures. For, in order that such a copy should have been of any use to its possessor, he must have been able to read. Now, for several centuries after the invasion and occupancy of the Western Empire by the barbarians, illiteracy was so general there, that, if we exclude the clergy, we shall find few even among the upper and wealthier classes of society who could read. Education as now understood seems to have been the exception, not the rule, during that time, so that it is certain that persons who could not understand a book written in their own language were to be met with in the ranks of the nobility, and among the highest officials of the State. The Emperor Charlemagne, who died in the ninth century, though a munificent patron of letters, "according to a very plain testimony, was incapable of writing."[1] Yet when, somewhat earlier, the gloom was thickest, according to the authority just cited, Ireland "both drew students from the Continent, and sent forth men of comparative eminence

[1] Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. ix., part i., p. 480.

into its schools and churches."[1] The Continent must indeed have stood in need of educators, when Heribaud, Comte Du Palais under Lewis II., in 823 signed a charter thus: "The sign of me, Herbaud, Count of the Sacred Palace, who was there, and made the sign of the cross, because I was ignorant of letters."[2] Even several centuries later prominent personages are met with equally destitute of education. Bertrand du Guesclin, who lived in the fourteenth century, though Constable of France, and, as his biographer says, "the greatest soldier of his age," according to the same authority, "like all the nobles of that time, never knew how to read or write."[3] Two hundred years afterwards another Constable of France, Anne de Montmorency, the undisputed head of the French nobility, was not possessed of greater literary attainments than had fallen to the lot of Bertrand.[4] Even more exalted dignitaries were not better educated than these two noblemen. Frederic Barbarossa, Emperor of Germany in the twelfth century, could not read, nor Philip the Hardy, King of France in the following century, nor John, King of Bohemia in the fourteenth century,[5] when Louis of Bavaria, Emperor of Germany, stood forth a worthy successor of Barbarossa in ferocity and illiteracy.[6] "Before the end of the eleventh century, and especially after the ninth, it was rare," says Hallam, "to find laymen in France who could read and write. The case was probably not better anywhere else except in Italy."[7] This sweeping charge of ignorance must, of course, include England. For Withred, King of Kent, who reigned from 671 to 725, made use of this formula in attaching his signature

[1] *Literature of Europe*, vol. I., part i., ch. i., p. 29.
[2] Maitland, *The Dark Ages*. p. 11. [3] *Dublin Review*, vol. III., 429.
[4] Ibid. [5] Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, c. ix., Part 1, p. 479, n. 3.
[6] Rohrbacher, *Hist. De L'Eglise*, Tom. XX., p. 270.
[7] Hallam, *Literature of Europe*, Part. i., c. p. 71.

to one of his charters: "I Withred, King of Kent, have confirmed all of the foregoing, to which, after having been dictated by me, I have, because ignorant of letters, attached the sign of the holy Cross with my own hand."[1] That the number of Withred's subjects or countrymen who were better educated than himself was for a long time comparatively small, is proved by the exemption from punishment, or arrest of judgment after conviction, granted to criminals capable of reading, an act calculated to encourage learning and not formally repealed till 1706.[2] In fact, Englishmen holding positions of honor and trust, as appears from the public records, were designated *marksmen* in a sense no longer attached to the word. Worcester and Webster agree in saying that, besides the ordinary meaning, which *marksman* now conveys, it also indicated a person "who, not being able to write, *marks* his name" with a cross as a substitute for his written signature. The original "solemn League and Covenant" subscribed in 1637, and preserved in the British Museum, exhibits quite an array of *marksmen*, all of whom, from their horror of Popery, left the cross unfinished, signing their name with a T instead of a †.[3] Shakespeare's father, though chief alderman of Stratford, like many others even of higher rank than his at the time, could not write his own name;[4] nor could the trustees of his marriage contract with Anne Hathway, in 1582, though otherwise most respectable people.[5] Hallam,[6] summing up his conclusions regarding the illiteracy that prevailed in Europe "for many centuries," declares that "it was rare for a layman of whatever rank to know how to sign his name." It may therefore be regarded as certain that

[1] Maitland's *Dark Ages*, p. 11.
[2] Blackstone, book iv., ch. 28.
[3] *Dublin Review*, vol. III., p. 430.
[4] *Am. Encyl.*
[5] *Dub. Review*, III., 430.
[6] *The Middle Ages*, ch, ix., part i., p. 479.

for a long period after the disruption of the Western Empire, the various races which established their homes on its ruins were generally uneducated, as the word is now understood, though in point of morality they were fully equal if not superior to their present descendants, and, while in general intelligence inferior to them, not by any means ranking beneath them in the possession of essential knowledge. Even Mr. Maitland, an Anglican minister, and a writer well qualified by his studies to speak on the subject, honestly confesses that he "cannot tell why, in things pertaining to the kingdom of God, and on which man can be enlightened only by the Word and Spirit of God, they might not be as truly and even as fully enlightened as any of mankind before or after their time."[1] But, unable as most of them were to read, the translation of the Bible into their own language or jargon could have been of no use whatever to the Christians of those times, and therefore any effort of the Church in that direction was in no sense necessary. Yet it must not be supposed that she left them in utter ignorance of the Bible, or of its sacred contents, for they were never present at divine worship without having portions of it read by the officiating priest, who, besides, was bound by canonical law to interpret and explain to them at least the Epistles and Gospels, on such occasions as they were accustomed to assemble together at church.

But, in the second place, had the laity been able to read, it was not possible to provide them with the Scriptures on account of the fabulous prices which books at the time commanded. The reproduction of an original work, by the tedious process of copying then in use, involved so much labor and expense, that even moderate libraries, if possessed at all outside of religious establishments, were only to be found among the

[1] *The Dark Ages*, p. 33, note.

educated and wealthy. Books were exceedingly scarce, because, except among the clergy, they found few readers, and because those few readers generally found that books could be procured only at a cost far beyond their means. What that cost was, it is impossible to determine exactly. But in a particular case it must have been regulated by the necessities of the seller, the eagerness of the purchaser, the intrinsic value of the book itself, the material on which it was written, the style of its binding, its chirography, its fidelity, actual condition, etc. The most that can be said on the point is that, while writers who have carefully examined it differ very widely in their estimates, they all agree in saying that the price of books before the printing press superseded the transcriber was much, even far, greater than it was afterwards. The following extracts from the Dublin Review will, however, give the reader a more correct idea of the prices at which books were sold before the introduction of the printing press than he could form from the preceding vague statements. "Ames, *in his History of the English Press* (Lond., 1749, 4to), says 'I have a folio manuscript in French, called *Roman de la Rose*, on the last leaf of which is wrote Cest lyver costa au Palais de Paris quarante couronnes d'or sans mentyr'[1] (*Dibdin's Typogr. Antiq.*, vol. I., p. 11). This sum is valued by Ames at £ 33, 6 s., 8d.; but it is considerably more. M. Petit Radel, (*Recherches sur les Bibliothèques*, Paris, 1819, 8vo.) writes: 'Au treizième siècle, le prix moyen des livres, non surchargés d'ornéments, était de quatre a cinque cents francs d'aujourd'hui.' The common price of a missal was five marks, equal to the yearly revenue of a vicar or curate. *Townley's Illustrations of Biblical Literature* (vol. II., p. 82), and Chevillier, the Parisian printer, in his *Histoire de l'Imprimerie* (Paris, 1694, 4to), says, that Louis XI. was obliged to pledge

[1] Vol. III., p. 430.

a quantity of plate, in addition to the joint bond of a nobleman, as security for the loan of a translation of the Arabic Physician, *Rhasis*." A writer in the American Encyclopedia [1] remarks, that "Stowe says, that in 1274 a Bible finely written sold for fifty marks, about £34, when wheat was 3s. 4d. a quarter, and labor 1d. a day." No doubt some prices quite exceptional were paid for books occasionally. One such case is commented on by Maitland, [2] who endeavors to account for it, without, however, denying the fact that at the time books were extremely rare and dear, a necessary consequence of the slow and expensive process by which copies were produced. Maitland, indeed, is "inclined to suppose that at this day (1845) a copy of our English Bible, paid for at the rate at which law stationers pay their writers for common fair-copy on paper, would cost between sixty and seventy pounds for the writing only; and farther, that the scribe must be both expert and industrious to perform the task in much less than ten months" [3] When, therefore, Richard of Bury, chancellor of England, gave the Abbot of St. Alban's fifty pounds weight of silver for some thirty or forty volumes; when, in the fifteenth century, Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, presented to the University of Oxford six hundred books, including one hundred and twenty estimated at one thousand pounds, and Peter Lombard's *Liber Sententiarum*, about the beginning of the fourteenth century, cost thirty shillings—nearly equivalent now to forty pounds [4] (that is, two hundred dollars), it must be conceded that manuscripts then rated a good deal higher than printed books do now. Hallam is of opinion that in the middle ages "books were in real value very considerably dearer (that is, in the ratio of several units to one) than at pres-

[1] Vol. III., p. 496.

[2] *Dark Ages*, p. 61. [3] P. 202.

[4] Hallam, *Middle Ages*, ch. ix., part ii., p. 641, note 5, and p. 642.

ent,"[1] and that "the price of books was diminished by four fifths after the invention of printing."[2]

Since it thus appears that the people generally, until a comparatively recent period, could not read, and the few who could had not the means to pay for Bibles, it was therefore neither necessary nor possible for the Church to place the Scriptures within the reach of all. Yet it is not to be supposed that the Bible was by any means a rare book; on the contrary, there is evidence at hand to prove that of all books ever written it has been the most frequently read, transcribed, and translated, even during those ages when, as Protestants commonly believe, it was unknown, or, if known, known only to the clergy, and studiously concealed from the laity in the impenetrable secrecy of an unknown tongue.

Let us therefore, with the assistance of respectable Protestant as well as Catholic writers, endeavor to refute the false statements made on the subject by several Protestant historians of the Reformation, and still believed by many whose knowledge of that religious revolution has been derived exclusively from such sources.

Among those who have earned an unenviable notoriety by retailing statements of the kind, Merle D'Aubigne (d. 1872), a Swiss minister, who professes to derive his information from such devoted disciples and credulous admirers of Martin Luther as John Mathesius and Melchior Adams, deserves especial mention. He has written a history of the Reformation[3] in French, which soon after its appearance was translated into English, and published in London. It has already passed through several editions in England and this country, and is generally regarded by Protestants as a standard authority on the

[1] *Literature of Europe*, Part i., ch. ii., § 24, p. 122, note 1. 452

[2] *Literature of Europe*, Part i., ch. iii., § 147, p. 253.

[3] See its errors exposed and refuted by Archbishop Spaulding in his *Hist. of the Prot. Reformation.*

subject of which it treats. The author represents the Bible as an unknown book in the time of Luther. Isaac Milner, Anglican dean of Carlisle (d. 1820), had with some variations told the same story before him. And most Protestants believe it to be as true as anything they read in the Gospels. There are, however, some honorable exceptions, among them being Rev. S. R. Maitland, a minister of the Church of England and librararian to the Archbishop of Canterbury. His position in the latter capacity enabled him to take a more correct view of the so called *Dark Ages* than is generally presented by Protestant writers, and he has given expression to that view in a *Series of Essays* published in London in 1844. D'Aubigne, professing to have derived his information from the early disciples and biographers of Luther, had told a blood-curdling story about "the indescribable feelings" with which Luther, when a student at the university of Erfurth, in his twentieth year, for the first time gazed on the Bible, a book which he discovered by chance in the library.[1] Luther's great luck, however, did not end here, for his historian tells us that, after he had entered the Augustinian convent at Erfurth, "he found another Bible fastened by a chain." Valuable books, even the Sacred Scriptures, were often secured in this way against bibliokleptics.[2] But D'Aubigne appears to emphasize the matter, as if the purpose of those who chained the Bible was to prevent it from being read. Had that been their intention, would they not have put it under lock and key, or destroyed it outright?

It was the wonderful discovery of the Bible by Luther, as described by D'Aubigne, which provoked the just and withering criticism of Maitland. The latter, after exposing some of the innumerable fallacies and false-

[1] D'Aubigne, vol. I., p. 131; Ibid., p. 132.

[2] Vide Maitland, *Dark Ages*, p. 286.

hoods which the persistent calumnies of such writers as Robertson, the historian, succeeded in inducing the Protestant public to accept as real facts characteristic of mediæval times, especially those times comprised within the *dark ages*, proceeds thus:—

"I am not such an enthusiast as to suppose that a series of paper in a magazine, desultory and superficial, as I sincerely acknowledge these to be, can do much to stop the repetition of falsehood long established, widely circulated, and maintained with all the tenacity of party prejudice. If I were, the occurrences of almost every day would, I hope, teach me wisdom. While these sheets have been going through the press, they have brought me a specimen quite worthy of Robertson, and so much to our present purpose that I cannot help noticing it. Even since the foregoing paragraph was written, a proof sheet has come from the printing office, wrapped in a waste quarter of a sheet of a book which I do not know that I have seen, but the name of which I have often heard, and which, I have reason to believe, has been somewhat popular of late. The head-line of the page before me is:

THE UNIVERSITY. LUTHER'S PIETY. D'AUBIGNE'S REFORMATION. DISCOVERY. THE BIBLE.

"Among the contents of the page thus headed, and in the column under "Discovery. The Bible," we find the following passage relating to Luther:"—

"'The young student passed at the university library every moment he could snatch from his academic duties. Books were still rare, and it was a high privilege in his eyes to be enabled to profit by the treasures collected in that vast collection. One day (he had been studying two years at Erfurth, and was twenty years of age) he opened one after another several books in the library, in order to become acquainted with their authors. A

volume he opens in its turn arrests his attention. He has seen nothing like it to this moment. He reads the title—it is a Bible! a rare book, unknown in those days. His interest is excited to a high degree; he is overcome with wonder at finding more in the volume than those fragments of the Gospels and Epistles which the Church had selected to be read in the temples every Sunday throughout the year. Till then, he had supposed these constituted the entire word of God; and now, behold, how many pages, how many chapters, how many books, of which he had not before a notion.'[1]

"Is it not odd that Luther had not by some chance or other heard of the Psalms?—But there is no use in criticising such nonsense. Such it must appear to every moderately informed reader, but he will not appreciate its absurdity until he is informed that on the same page this precious historian has informed his readers, that in the course of the two preceding years Luther had 'applied himself to learn the philosophy of the middle ages in the writings of Occam, Scot, Bonaventure, and Thomas Aquinas;'—of course, none of these poor creatures knew anything about the Bible.

"The fact, however, to which I have so repeatedly alluded is simply this—the writings of the dark ages are, if I may use the expression, *made of the Scriptures.* I do not merely mean that the writers constantly quoted the Scriptures, and appealed to them as authorities on all occasions, as other writers have done since their day—though they did this, and it is a strong proof of their authority with them—but I mean that they thought and spoke and wrote the thoughts and words and phrases of the Bible, and that they did this constantly and habitually, as the natural mode of expressing themselves. They did it, too, not exclusively in theological or ecclesiastical matters, but in histories, biographies,

[1] *Dark Ages*, pp. 467, 470.

familiar letters, legal instruments, and documents of every description."

Maitland in a note adds the following remarks regarding the account which Dean Milner had given of Luther's wonderful "Discovery."

"After I had written this I was curious to see how Milner (in this case, the Dean) had stated the matter; and I was surprised to find the following passage, with the capitals as I here give it:—

"'In the second year after Luther had entered into the monastery, he accidentally met with a Latin Bible in the library. It proved to him a treasure. Then he first discovered that there were MORE Scripture passages extant than those which were read to the people: for the Scriptures were at that time very little known to the world' (vol. IV., p. 324). Really, one hardly knows how to meet such statements, but will the reader be so good as to remember that we are not now talking of the Dark Ages, but of a period when the *press* had been *half a century* in operation; and will he give a moment's reflection to the following statement, which I believe to be correct, and which cannot, I think, be so far inaccurate as to affect the argument. To say nothing of *parts* of the Bible, or of books whose place is uncertain, we know of at least *twenty* different *editions* of the *whole* Latin Bible printed in *Germany only*, before Luther was born. These had issued from Augsburg, Strasburg, Cologne, Ulm, Mentz (two), Basle (four), Nuremberg (ten), and were dispersed through Germany, I repeat, before Luther was born; and I may add that before that event there was a printing press at work in this very town of Erfurth, where, more than twenty years after, he is said to have made his 'discovery.' Some may ask, what was the Pope about all this time? Truly, one would think he must have been off his guard; but as to these German performances, he might have found

employment nearer home, if he had looked for it. Before Luther was born, the Bible had been printed in Rome, and the printers had had the assurance to memorialize his Holiness, praying that he would help them off with some copies. It had peen printed, too, at Naples, Florence, and Piacenza; and Venice alone had furnished eleven editions. No doubt we should be within the truth, if we were to say that beside the multitude of manuscript copies, not yet fallen into disuse, the *press* had issued fifty different editions of the whole Latin Bible, to say nothing of Psalters, New Testaments, or other parts. And yet, more than twenty years after, we find a young man, who had received 'a very liberal education,' who, 'had made great proficiency in his studies at Magdeburg, Eisenach, and Erfurt,' and who, nevertheless, did not know what a Bible was, simply because 'the Bible was unknown in those days.'"[1]

The story, therefore, about the Bible being unknown in the time of Luther, and of its discovery by that worthy, is simply one of the many slanders concocted by the early reformers, for the purpose of justifying their opposition to ecclesiastical authority and of gaining adherents to their apostasy. Such reckless slanders had done good service in dragging whole nations into heresy and keeping them there, and for this reason historical romancers, emulous of the infamy achieved by D'Aubigne and Milner, have repeated again and again the harrowing tale told by these two writers, until many an otherwise honest Protestant is convinced, that it would be absurd to call it in question. Nor was it until Protestantism had secured a firm footing in Europe, and its permanency had become apparently an assured fact, that Protestant critics, like Maitland, had the candor to acknowledge that that tale was untrue in all its details, though most of them must have known well that

[1] *Dark Ages*, p. 469.

such was the case. This, however, is simply a specimen of the agencies employed to establish the Protestant religion, and perpetuate popular prejudice against the Catholic Church.

It was only, however, by the force of persistent falsehood that the delusion was kept up so long among the Protestant masses. For none but the most ignorant, such, for example, as believe whatever their teachers say, if said against the Church, could have had, if they cared to hear both sides, the slightest reason for supposing or suspecting that the Bible in the time of Luther was an unknown book.[1] On the contrary, the evidence that such was not the case, and that the Church neither then nor formerly was opposed to the circulation of the Scripture, was within reach of almost every one who could read or write his own name. For, not to mention the venerable Syriac and other translations, which long before Luther's time had been made into the languages of Christendom, and of some of which we will have more to say immediately, there was, besides the Greek Bible, which had existed, part long before, and part from the beginning of Christianity, and was intelligible to the greater part of Christians in the East, as it still is to many of them,—the Latin Vulgate, coeval, it may be said, with the Apostles, and universally used throughout the West.

And let it not be said that Western Christendom might as well have been without a Bible, if it had none but one written in Latin. For Dr. Davidson, a stalwart Protestant, declares, that "Latin. . . . in the fourteenth century was all but universal."[2] He might have added,

[1] For the ignorance that prevails on this subject among Protestants, their teachers or leaders are alone responsible; thus, while edition after edition of D'Aubigne's History has been issued by them in the most attractive style, they have allowed Maitland's work to get out of print, so that it is not to be found now in any Protestant book-store.

[2] Kitto's *Cyclopedia*, vol. II., p. 917. See on this point Hallam, *Litera-*

that it was commonly understood by all educated persons, was more or less known by the common people even as late as the time of Luther, and in some countries did not become obsolete until long after that fallen monk had passed to his account. In fact, the Latin language continued to be used in codes and edicts under the Byzantine rulers until the Eastern emperor was compelled to abandon all claims to supremacy in the West. But in the West itself Latin was taught in almost every school and college, and remained the only channel through which writers on ecclesiastical, political, scientific, and historical subjects generally gave expression to their thoughts. In all parliamentary, judicial, administrative, and diplomatic affairs, the proceedings were mostly conducted in Latin and recorded in the same language. For such purposes the rude idioms spoken by the Goths, Vandals, Lombards, and other barbarous races recently established in Europe, were altogether unfit—and the consequence was the general adoption of the Latin language as the one already most in use, and therefore, on that account as well as because it had attained its full growth, the only form of speech in which it was possible to maintain international intercourse, or conduct business between the subjects of the same government. Among those uncouth invaders who had crushed out Roman supremacy in the West, Latin, if not generally spoken, was soon very generally employed in all matters pertaining to affairs of state. In fact, until the middle of the sixteenth century it remained the official language of the French courts. As late as that period it was written and spoken everywhere by theologians and savants with a fluency and purity not altogether unworthy of the Augustan age. And as early as the eighth century Eng-

ture of Europe, Part iii., ch. 1; *Am Encycl.* (Latin); *Encycl. Britt.* (Latin); Spalding, *Hist. of Prot. Ref.*, vol. I., p. 294.

lish ladies must have possessed considerable knowledge of Latin. For some of them composed works and carried on their correspondence in that language.[1] Even now there is hardly a language spoken in Europe or America that is not largely indebted to it. The very peasantry in some parts of Europe were until recently imbued with some knowledge of it. Indeed, it has been truly said that in Poland, for instance, not much more than a century ago, it was still spoken "by the coachman as well as the bishop." And in Hungary it remained the language of the diet and county assemblies until far in the present century. In Germany and Holland, at the present time, books on scientific subjects are often still composed in it. Besides, it is not so very long since English Protestant writers gave it the preference in discussing questions which interested none but the learned. Even the list of Protestant authors who composed their most celebrated works in Latin extends from the sixteenth to the present century, thus connecting the present age with that in which Luther commenced to bellow in bad Latin. Among others whose names are found in that list are John Drusius, Lewis de Dieu, Hugh Grotius, Solomon Glassius, John Le Clerc, Daniel and Nicholas Heinsius, father and son, the celebrated Vossius with his four less distinguished relatives, John Gottlob Carpzov, John Henry Pareau, John David Michaelis, the Rosenmüllers, father and son, all of Germany or Holland; Claudius Salmasius of France; Francis Bacon, Brian Walton, John Milton, Humphrey Hody, Isaac Newton, Robert Lowth, George Bull, Thomas Burnet of England; John Pinkerton (d. 1826), who wrote in Latin his *Lives of the Saints of Scotland;* Emanuel Swedenborg of Sweden, etc. It thus appears that the several nations which arose out of the ruins of the Roman Empire in Europe had, while pass-

[1] Lingard, *Anglo Saxon Church*, p. 189, note 4.

ing from Paganism to Christianity, become more or less familiar with the language then (and still) used by the Church while she was engaged in converting and civilizing them. It is, therefore, evident that, had the Protestant part of Western Christendom up to the present time been without any other means of access to the Scriptures than that afforded by the Latin Vulgate, it would be untrue to say, as D'Aubigne and Milner have done, that the Bible was an unknown book when the reformation commenced. For up to that time the laity knew even a good deal more about the language of the Vulgate than since, although, as just seen, several of them in the interval, while writing, preferred it to their own. The very fact, therefore, that the Bible approved as a standard by the Catholic Church has been all along written and printed, whether before or since the Reformation, in a language understood by all educated persons, is a sufficient answer to those who say that she is opposed to the circulation of the Scriptures. But let him who has any doubt on this subject remember that it has already been shown that, hardly had the printing press been invented, when it was employed by the Church to provide each Catholic nation with a version of the Scripture in its own language—then say, is it not untrue and unjust to impute to the Church any intention to withhold from the people the Word of God as contained in the Bible?

CHAPTER XXXI.

AMPLE TESTIMONY STILL AT HAND TO PROVE THAT, WHEN THE CHURCH INTRODUCED CHRISTIANITY TO ENGLAND, SHE PLACED ENGLISH VERSIONS OF THE SCRIPTURE IN THE HANDS OF THE PEOPLE, THOUGH MOST OF THE RECORDS CONTAINING THAT TESTIMONY PERISHED IN THE WHOLESALE DESTRUCTION TO WHICH THE ENGLISH LIBRARIES WERE CONSIGNED BY THE PROTESTANT REFORMERS.

But let us push the inquiry farther back, as all has not been said that can be said on the subject of the preceding chapter. For it can be easily shown, so far at least as England is concerned, that, although the records of early Christianity in that country are extremely meagre, there is good reason to believe that the preaching of the Gospel to its pagan inhabitants was soon followed, if not accompanied, by the introduction of the Scriptures. That the entire Bible was translated into their vernacular from the first cannot be proved. But that portions of it were thus rendered intelligible to such of the people as could read, not long after they embraced the faith, is so certain, that the fact is maintained generally by Protestant writers [1] and denied by nobody who has examined the evidence.

Gildas, who belonged to the sixth century, is the earliest British writer cited in connection with this subject. While describing the Diocletian persecution, as it raged

[1] Vide Horne, *Introd. to the Study of the S. Script.*, II., p. 246; Blunt, on *English Bible*.

in England most probably not more than a century after the introduction of Christianity, he remarks that "all the copies of Scripture that could be found were burned in the streets." [1] This was about the beginning of the fourth century. And by that time the Scriptures must have been rather widely distributed among the people of England, as a few copies would hardly have attracted the attention or aroused the vengeance of the persecutors. It cannot be proved, indeed, that any of the copies then consigned to the flames were writtten in the vernacular, but that some of them were may be fairly supposed, both because they were destroyed as instruments employed in propagating the Christian religion, which would imply that they were understood by the people, and because it appears that not long after translations of at least certain portions of the Bible were in existence among British Christians. And this is the opinion of an Anglican minister [2] who has carefully studied the subject.

For the Venerable Bede, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, [3] says, that St. Aidan, Bishop of Lindisfarne (d. 651), employed all whom he had about him, laymen as well as clergy, in reading the Scriptures or learning the Psalms. It need hardly be observed that in this case the laymen of Northumbria unable to read the Latin Vulgate must have had a version in their own language. From the narrative of the same venerable writer, [4] we also learn that Cædmon, a lay-monk of Whitby (d. 680), who had, when an illiterate stable-boy, gained distinction as a poet, composed a metrical version of several parts of the Old and New Testament from English translations provided for him by the monks, who understood Latin.

According to Usher, [5] Eadfrith, Bishop of Lindisfarne

[1] *Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum*, Tom. viii., p. 708.
[2] Blunt, *English Bible*.
[3] B. III. ch. v.
[4] *Eccl. Hist.* B. iv., ch. xxiv.
[5] *Works*, XII.

(d. 721), is said to have translated most of the sacred books, and a similar tradition prevails regarding the Venerable Bede (d. 735), Alcuin (d. 804), and King Alfred (d. 901). Of these works the earliest one extant is an English Psalter, the first fifty psalms of which are in prose, and the rest in verse, it having been written by Aldhelm, long Abbot of Malmesbury, and at his death, in 709, Bishop of Sherborne. A copy of it is preserved in the National Library at Paris. It was printed at Oxford, in 1835, and is regarded as one of the earliest monuments of the English language now in existence.

Next in date, so far as can be ascertained, is the volume known as the Lindisfarne or St. Cuthbert's Evangelistarium [1] and preserved in the British Museum. It was written in Latin by Eadfrith about 680, and illuminated by Ethelwold, afterwards, 724–740, Bishop of Lindisfarne. Still later an interlinear English translation was added by Ealdred, probably the monk who was subsequently (724–740) Bishop of Chester le Street. This rare copy of the Gospels was published in 1857, and also in 1854–65.

Another, similar volume, of a somewhat later date, and known as the Rushworth Gospels, is preserved in the Bodleian library. It is the production of Mac Regol, an Irish scribe, about 820. The English translation is given between the Latin lines, having been inserted about a century afterwards by a scribe named Owen and one Faerman, a priest of Harewood.

In the tenth century there was in circulation a translation of the first seven books of the Old Testament, which had been made by Aelfric, Archbishop of Canterbury, from 994 to 1005. This Heptateuch was probably only part of the Old Testament, perhaps of the entire English Bible, by the same hand, as translations of the

[1] Alban Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, March 20; Lingard, *Anglo Saxon Church*, p. 161.

books of Kings, Esther, Job, *Judith*, *Machabees*, and the four Gospels, belonging to the same date, are still extant. Copies of the Heptateuch are to be found in the British Museum and Bodleian library. A copy of the Gospels exists in the library of Corpus Christi, Cambridge. The Heptateuch was printed in 1698. What remains of this old version justifies the supposition, that when it was made, the deutero books were believed by the people of England to belong to the Bible.

There are, besides, many copies of the Anglo-Saxon Psalter and Gospels in the British Museum, in the libraries of Oxford and Cambridge, and elsewhere. Some of them have the Anglo-Saxon translation between the lines of the Latin Vulgate, others contain only that translation. Some of these Psalters were written as late as the twelfth century, thus implying, as has been remarked, that what is understood generally as Anglo-Saxon was in use long after the Norman conquest, and even when medieval English had to a certain extent supplanted the preceding form of speech.

What was done to preserve a knowledge of the Scriptures among the people of England from the period we have now reached until 1582, when the Rheims New Testament appeared, it is impossible to say. We know, indeed, that from the latter part of the fourteenth century, when Wickliffe and his associates were the first to attempt the propagation of error in England, with the aid of corrupt versions of God's written revelation, until the year 1611, when King James's version appeared, several such versions, all intended for the same purpose, were made; for nearly all of them in a more or less complete state remain to this day. They helped to perpetuate the creed forced on the people of England by Henry VIII. and his successors; and the care with which they have been all along preserved shows, that they have been well repaid for the service they ren-

dered to national apostasy. Before that apostasy was consummated, and while the struggle between truth and error was still in progress, not only must there have been many old Catholic versions extant, but, it may be reasonably supposed, new ones were written; since the advance of error rendered that more necessary than ever. Emulous, however, of the infamy achieved by the satellites of Diocletian, who burned the Scriptures in the streets, the so-called reformers of religion seem to have taken good care that not a single scrap of any Catholic Bible on which they could lay their hands, nor any written relic of the religion professed by their forefathers, should ever reach posterity. All this is indeed confessed by some of themselves. Thus John Bale, a protegé of the notorious Cromwell and a base apostate, who was afterwards appointed Protestant bishop of Ossory in Ireland, writing in 1549, says: "I judge this to be true, and utter it with heaviness, that neither the Britons under the Romans and Saxons, nor yet the English people under the Danes and Normans, had ever such damage of their learned monuments, as we have seen in our time." The Protestant writer who copies this humiliating confession candidly adds: "About that time, among hundreds of other libraries, those of the city of London and of the University of Oxford entirely disappeared, the very book-shelves of the latter being sold for firewood.[1]

The only name which Layton, one of the royal commissioners whom Henry VIII. employed for suppressing religious communities and plundering libraries, has for the precious contents of the latter is, "Dunce." In his report to "Sec. Cromwell regarding the progress of the barbarous work in which he was engaged at Oxford University, this worthy says: "We found all the great quadrant-court full of the leaves of Dunce, the

[1] Rev. J. H. Blunt, *English Bible.*

winds blowing them into every corner, and there we found one Mr. Greenfield, of Buckinghamshire, gathering part of the said book-leaves (as he said) therewith to make him scuels, or blaunshears (inclosures or fences), to keep the deer within the wood, thereby to have the better cry with his hounds."[1]

What an irreparable injury must have been inflicted on the interests of Christian literature, when Henry's vandals were let loose on those precious repositories, where were garnered the various results produced by the studies of the best minds, which had been devoted to the advancement of divine and human knowledge!

Those royal delegates, says Anthony Wood[2] (d. 1695), permitted or directed the libraries fitted with innumerable works both native and foreign to be despoiled at Oxford. "Hence a great multitude of MSS. having no mark of superstition about them (unless it were to be found in the red letters on their titles) were adjudged to the flames, or the vilest purposes; works of scholastic theology were sold off among those exercising the lowest description of arts; and those which contained circles or diagrams it was thought good to mutilate or burn, as containing proofs of the magical nature of their contents." Dr. Bliss, Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford (d. 1857), in his edition of Wood's work just cited, has drawn an equally sad picture of the ravages committed at Oxford by Henry's delegates. "The mischief committed at this time," says he, "can hardly be conceived. I have seen several fine old chronicles and volumes of miscellaneous literature mutilated, because the illuminations were supposed by the reforming visitors to represent popes and saints, when they were really intended for the portraits of Kings and warriors; nay,

[1] Maitland, *Dark Ages*, p. 276.

[2] A Protestant Graduate of Merton College, Oxford. See *Hist. and Antiq. of Oxford*, B. I, p. 271, Oxford edition. 1674.

some were absolutely mathematical figures! The malice of those barbarians was only equalled by their ignorance." [1]

Oxford was not the only place that felt the malice of these barbarians. Instigated by their brutal sovereign, as well as by their own hope of plunder and their hypocritical horror of what they called popery, these sacrilegious wretches pushed their investigations wherever there was anything to steal, or any object suggestive of England's former faith to profane, mutilate, or destroy. "Whole libraries," says an authority quoted by Mr. Maitland, [2] "were destroyed, or made waste paper of, or consumed for the vilest purposes. The splendid and magnificent Abbey of Malmesbury, which possessed some of the finest manuscripts in the kingdom, was ransacked, and its treasures either sold or burnt to serve the commonest purposes of life. An antiquary who travelled through that town, many years after the dissolution, relates, that he saw broken windows patched up with remnants of the most valuable MSS. on vellum, and that the bakers had not even then consumed the stores they had accumulated, in heating their ovens."

Anthony Wood, [3] quoted above, says: "As to the abbeys and convents, while their destruction was in progress, such little care was taken of the books collected therein, that Bale, [4] the greatest enemy the Catholics ever had, bitterly complained about it to Edward VI. [5] since they who got and purchased the religious houses at the dissolution of them took the libraries as a part of the bargain and booty—reserving of those

[1] Maitland, *Dark Ages*, p. 284. note 6.

[2] Ibid. p. 218. note 9.

[3] *Hist. and Antiq. of Oxford*, B. I., p. 272.

[4] Cited supra, p. 466.

[5] What follows is the version of Spelman, a Protestant. See his *Hist. and Fate of Sacrilege*, p. 113, Lond. ed. of 1888, a work written about the middle of the seventeenth century. Wood's work was written in English originally, but was afterwards translated into Latin. It is that Latin translation which is now before us.

library books some to serve their jakes, some to scour their candlesticks, and some to rub their boots; some they sold to the grocers and soapsellers, and some they sent over the sea to the book binders. And after, he also addeth, I knew a merchantman, which all this time shall be nameless, that bought the contents of two noble libraries for forty shillings each, a shame it is to be spoken: this stuff hath he occasioned instead of grey paper by the space of more than these ten years, and yet he hath enough for many years to come."

These extracts from the books of prominent Protestants, who knew well what they were writing about, will after all give the reader only an imperfect idea of the wholesale destruction to which the royal commissioners consigned every scrap of paper or vellum, written or printed, when it was supposed, right or wrong, to be the work of a Catholic. For it is to be remembered that at the time, as was the case long after, many a zealous reformer unofficially promoted the success of the fanatical crusade against literature. An Anglican bishop, whose name is not given, is said, for example, by a distinguished Protestant writer of the seventeenth century, to have burned all the registers and documents of his see, with the avowed purpose of thus getting rid of popery.[1] Yet, as we have already seen, some literary relics of former ages escaped the general wreck, in which the English libraries were involved at the Reformation. That some of Bede's works and a few others survive must be attributed to the vigilance with which they were guarded by their Catholic possessors, or to the malignant stupidity of the royal plunderers, who may have believed, what not a few Protestants have since asserted, that these works were written by men who professed the same principles with themselves. At all events, it was such a belief, well founded however

[1] Maitland, *Dark Ages*, p. 499.

in that particular case, which preserved for the benefit of common Protestantism works attributed to or proceeding from Wyckliffe, Purvey, Hereford, Tyndale, Coverdale, and others—prose writers or versifiers—who were contemporary with some of those notorious characters.

That among the works which disappeared in the destruction of the public and private libraries of England during the reign of Henry VIII. were many English Bibles, cannot be doubted. They must have been then in existence, as the practice of translating the Scriptures into the language of the common people commenced, as we have seen, at a very early period. Besides, the use of translations in England, long before the time of Henry VIII., is placed beyond all controversy by the testimony of writers, Protestant as well as Catholic, all Englishmen and belonging to the same century that witnessed the crimes of that infamous monarch. Sir Thomas Moore (d. 1535) declares[1] that "the whole Bible was, long before Wyckliffe's days, by virtuous and learned men translated into the English tongue, and by good and godly people with devotion and soberness well and reverently read." This statement is fully confirmed by the Protestant Archbishop Cranmer (d. 1556), who writes,[2] that the Holy Bible was "translated and read in the Saxon tongue, which at that time was our mother tongue" (that is, some hundreds of years before he wrote[3]), "whereof there remaineth divers copies, found in old abbeys, of such antique manner of writing and speaking, that few men now be able to read and understand them. And when this language waxed old and out of common usage, because folk should not lack the fruit of reading, it was again translated into the newer language, whereof yet also many copies remain, and be daily found." No good Protestant will ques-

[1] *Dial.* iii., 14.

[2] *Pref. to Author. Version* of 1540.

[3] Blunt, *English Bible.*

tion the accuracy of any statement made by such a man as Cranmer, and as little will he be disposed to reject the evidence of John Fox, commonly known as the English martyrologist, who died in 1587. Now, this same old Fox, in his dedication to an edition of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, deliberately deposeth that, "If histories be well examined, we shall find, both before the Conquest and after as well as before John Wyckliffe was born, as since, the whole body of the Scriptures by sundry men translated into our country-tongue." That is conclusive. But what became of all those translations, or of the "divers copies" which remained as late as 1540, when Cranmer wrote? They, answers[1] Rev. J. H. Blunt, an English Protestant, "doubtless disappeared in the vast and ruthless destruction of libraries which took place a few years after that date." And then the men of the new creed, who entered into possession of the rifled sanctuaries, where those libraries had been reverently preserved for so many ages, turned round and upbraided those of the old creed with having deprived the people of the Bible! For a long time this impudent calumny did good service to the cause of common Protestantism. Nor was it easy for Catholics to refute it, as the destruction of their religious books had been so thorough, that they were able to point to only a few fragments of former versions as evidence that the Church had at all times provided their forefathers with the Holy Scriptures in their own language. But the exposure of the calumny has already been so complete, that no respectable writer would now venture to risk his reputation by repeating it. Among the versions which disappeared at the destruction of the libraries, was undoubtedly that of John de Trevisa, Vicar of Berkeley, Gloucester, a contemporary of Wyckliffe. Hartwell Horne[2]

[1] *English Bible.*

[2] *Bibl. App. to Vol. II. of Introd. to Study of the Scriptures*, p. 63.

doubts that he ever made one. But his only reason for doing so is the supposition that it was never printed. Such a doubt can have no weight against the testimony of Anthony Wood, who plainly asserts that Trevisa translated the Holy Bible into the vernacular,"[1] an assertion which is confirmed by the testimony of other respectable writers.[2] Besides, Trevisa's version may have been written before the printing press was brought into general use in England. Doubtless other works, written as well after as before his, have never been and never will be printed. Many of them, when the English libraries were looted by Henry's myrmidons, were, as we have too good reason to know, doomed to the flames or treated as rubbish. Such, probably, was the fate which befell the version of Trevisa.

[1] *Hist. and Antiq. of Oxford*, B. II., p. 95.

[2] Vide *Dublin Rev.*, vol. I., p. 382.

CHAPTER XXXII.

In England the Scriptures Never Buried in Oblivion while the country remained Catholic.

Horne, in the part of his work just cited,[1] states that "Christianity was planted in Britain in the first century," but seems to think that the British had no "translation of the Scriptures in their own language, earlier than the eighth century." It appears, therefore, that this writer, a highly respected one among many of those readers for whom he composed his work, believed with some others of his profession, that Christianity was introduced into England, and planted there, long before its people were supplied with the Bible. Be it so, notwithstanding all the evidence we have to the contrary. But what follows? Why! that Christianity was planted in Britain by one of the Apostles, or by one of their disciples; otherwise the planting could not have occurred in the first century. The advocates of this theory, until lately a very common one among zealous Protestants, must therefore hold that a Church was organized and continued among the Britons for several centuries, without any of its members having ever seen a Bible in their own language, though that Church had been planted by Apostolic teachers, and maintained afterwards by the regular successors of those teachers. Either, then, the Bible was translated before the eighth century into the language of the Britons, and in that case every vestige of that British version has long since utterly perished and been for-

[1] P. 246.

gotten, or the Apostolic men who first preached Christianity in Britain during the first century, as well as the subsequent generations of preachers for the next seven centuries, failed to provide those British Christians with the Bible—the omission resulting, of course, from the fact that those preachers believed that the Britons could be very good Christians, though they lived and died without ever seeing a Bible. For those who share Mr. Horne's opinion the dilemma must be a rather perplexing affair. It is not easy to see how they can escape being gored, whatever horn they take hold of. For, British translations of the Scripture made and preserved during the first seven centuries must have been made and preserved under the auspices of the Catholic Church, thus proving that, contrary to common Protestant belief, she encourages the reading of the Scriptures by the people. On the other hand, the organization and perpetuation of genuine Christian communities in Britain for seven centuries without the Scriptures would demonstrate, what no thorough Protestant would admit, that pure Christianity without the Bible is possible.

In the same part[1] of the work which is the subject of the preceding remarks, the learned author observes, after enumerating so far as known the Saxon versions made from the eighth to the tenth century, that "A chasm of several centuries ensued, during which the Sacred Scriptures appear to have been buried in oblivion, the general reading of them being prohibited by the Papal See," two positive statements, which deserve to be separately and seriously considered. The chasm referred to, if real, not imaginary, must have extended from the date of Ælfric's translation, which is assigned to the end of the tenth century by Mr. Horne, as far as the year 1290, when, as he states,[2] an English

[1] P. 63. [2] P. 63.

translation of the Bible is said by Archbishop Usher to have appeared. Now the existence of any chasm at that or any other time since England became Christian is flatly contradicted, as we have just seen, by the concordant testimony of More, Cranmer, and Fox. For this reason alone the chasm theory must be rejected as utterly untenable. And though, in consequence of the ruthless manner in which the English libraries were swept out of existence by the Protestant reformers, there be no evidence now at hand to prove, that any new English translation of the Bible was made within the period included in the supposed chasm, we have no more right to suspect, that at that time the Scriptures were buried in oblivion, than we have to say, that from the beginning of the seventeenth century until the present time the Bible has remained an unknown book among the descendants of English reformers, because during that period the Bible has never been translated into their language. The latter assertion would be pronounced preposterous, since King James's translation has remained in use among English Protestants ever since it first appeared. Then, why not reject the former assertion as equally preposterous, seeing, we are assured by respectable and disinterested witnesses, that both before and since the time of Wyckliffe, and even up to the period of the Reformation, the Scriptures were translated again and again into the language of the English; in fact, as often as the changes in that language rendered that necessary. And if during any protracted period, while England remained Catholic, the work of translating the Scriptures, which seems to have been rarely, if at all, interrupted, was suspended, may it not be reasonably supposed, that translations already made sufficed for the wants of the people, until the exigencies of the language demanded, or more favorable circumstances facilitated the execution of others. Even at the worst of times,

during the revolutions and devastations caused by Romans and Saxons, by Danes and Normans, it would be untrue to say, that the Scriptures were buried in oblivion, since the people must have been always familiarized with the Scriptures by means of translations made at least of detached books, of the Gospels and Epistles in the Missal, not to speak of English narratives of the Passion of Our Lord, or some other part if not the whole of His life, and of the many English Psalters known to have existed from the earliest times, as well as numerous pious tracts intended for the instruction of all classes. Those fragments of all such writings which have come down to us from various dates, between the close of the seventh and end of the twelfth century,—and they are by no means rare or apocryphal,—stamp as unreal, unhistorical, and absurd the gratuitous supposition, that in Catholic England the Scriptures were at any time buried in oblivion. Those writings, too, besides furnishing satisfactory reasons for believing, that at no period were the Scriptures treated with indifference or consigned to oblivion in Catholic England, clearly prove by their contents, whether fragmentary or complete, that no attempt was made there to corrupt or mutilate the Bible, until the country was wrenched from the Centre of Unity by the arbitrary proceedings of a monarch, whose brutal cruelty was only equalled by his beastly instincts. Besides the versions already mentioned, there are two English translations of the Psalter, which, as well as the translation of Trevisa, bring us close if not fully up to the period when the first attempt to infuse an un-Catholic spirit into an English Bible was made by Wyckliffe or his associates, about the middle of the fourteenth century. Of these two Psalters several copies are still preserved. One was written by William de Schorham, who was vicar of Chart Sutton, in Kent, in the year 1320. The other was the work of Richard Rolle, (d. 1349), an

Augustinian priest, and commonly called the Hermit of Hampole, near Doncaster, York. He wrote a commentary on the Psalms, and having consented to translate it into English, he inserted in the translation an English version of the Psalms, the Latin of which had been incorporated in the original. He was also the author of several ascetic tracts, some of which, at least, have been published in the *Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum*, Tome XXVI. In these tracts he cites the proto and deutero books of the Old Testament indiscriminately, thus showing that in his time no distinction was made between the two classes of books in England.

The facts cited in the preceding paragraph abundantly prove, that for several centuries after the tenth, indeed, it might be said up to the Reformation, the Scriptures received in England as much attention as was shown them there at any time before or since. Nay, more; for during those centuries they seem to have been more highly prized than at any previous or subsequent period, if the degree of esteem in which they were held is to be measured by the amount of care and expense bestowed on their embellishment, or by the rank they held among the most precious objects possessed by the Church, or by the fact that they were presented as valuable gifts from one Christian to another.

To show the value attached to the Scriptures in the ages of which we are speaking, let us cull a few out of the many facts which, as bearing on this point, Maitland has collected together. Brethevold,[1] who became Bishop of Salisbury perhaps in A.D. 1006, sent two copies of the Gospels to the monastery of Glastonbury, where he had himself been a monk. We may be sure the gift was a valuable one, intended, as it no doubt was, to express the affection which the prelate retained for the community of which he had been a member. And

[1] *Dark Ages*, p. 210.

we may be sure it was highly esteemed by his former brethren, although Maitland warns us, that we are not to suppose that the monastery had no copy of the Gospels,—quite a superfluous hint however, as the monks had a good deal of the Gospels and a large amount of the other Scriptures in their Missals, Breviaries, etc. In the year 1141, Hide Abbey, near Winchester, was burned. The monks afterwards gathered out of the ashes sixty pounds of silver and fifteen pounds of gold. The silver and gold, or at least a good part of it, had been probably used in ornamenting the Scriptures, though on this point the historian is silent. For we are told that a monk of Clugni, who was afterwards placed in charge of the Abbey, stripped *ten* copies of the Gospels of the *gold*, *silver*, and *precious gems* with which they were adorned.[1]

We are also informed that Ralph, Bishop of Rochester, in 1114 gave a "textum pulchre decoratum" to his church. Maitland here is not sure that "textus" means a copy of one or more of the Gospels. But of this there is no doubt, for, according to Migne's *Lexicon of Mediæval Latinity*, the gift was a beautifully gilt *manuscript copy of the Gospels*.[2]

Walter, a subsequent bishop of the same see, appointed in 1148, also donated a *golden* manuscript copy of the Gospels.[3]

John, Bishop of Bath in 1160, when bequeathing to the blessed Apostle St. Peter and to his servants, the monks, his collection of ecclesiastical ornaments, must have left several copies of the Gospels to the Abbey church, and must have valued these copies very highly, for he enumerated them among the most precious articles which a bishop has to dispose of at his death, thus: "In crosses, in copies of the Gospels, in chalices, etc." Here, Maitland says, "the reader will observe, that these

[1] *Dark Ages*, 220. [2] P. 209. [3] Ibid.

costly books were considered as a part of the treasure of the Church rather than merely as books; and, indeed, the Bishop bequeathed them as a distinct legacy from his whole library (plenarium armarium meum), which he also gave to the Church."[1] In fact, these "books seem to have been considered by the Bishop at least as equally valuable with the crosses which he used, or the consecrated chalices with which he offered the holy sacrifice.

About 1098, Godfrey, Abbot of Malmesbury, in order to pay the tax imposed by William Rufus for the purchase of Normandy, stripped no less than *twelve* copies of the Gospels. Even in this case the very coverings must have been valuable. And the language in which William the historian, who died about 1150, refers to it, shows that the act of the Abbot was regarded as a desecration of the Scriptures. "He did it," says William, "by the advice of the most wicked, whom I might name, if the participation of others in sin would lessen the crime of the principal."[2] Who, after reading this, will say that the Bible in England was treated with less respect than it receives there now?

William de Longchamp, who became bishop of Ely in 1190, had contributed one hundred and sixty marks towards the redemption of William Rufus, held a prisoner by the duke of Austria, and to raise the amount pawned *thirteen* copies of the Gospels, including one of great value, which had belonged to King Edgar.[3]

At a visitation of the treasury of St. Paul's, in 1295, by Ralph de Baudoke, or Baldock, the dean (afterwards bishop) of London, it was found to contain *twelve* copies of the Gospels, all adorned with *silver*, some with *gilding*, *pearls*, and *gems*; and another, called[4] a wooden codex

[1] *Dark Ages*, p. 200. [2] Ibid., p. 218. [3] Ibid.

[4] Textus ligneus desuper ornatus platis argenteis deauratis cum subtili triphorio in superiori limbo continens xi. capsas cum reliquiis ibidem descriptis.

of the Gospels, which was ornamented with silver gilt plates, had a delicate triphorium on the upper edge, and contained eleven relic cases with a description of the relics. Besides these Gospels, there were six Epistolaries, four Evangelistaries—books containing the Epistles and Gospels belonging to the Missal—two Bibles, one in ancient, the other in modern letters,—the latter consisting of two volumes,—a glossed copy of the Epistles of St. Paul, the same of the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John, two copies of St. Matthew and St. Mark with the commentary of St. Thomas Aquinas, and the twelve prophets, glossed."[1]

Finally, according to the Saxon Chronicle, King Edgar took the coronotion oath, in 1066, on what is called "Christ's book," no doubt the Holy Gospels, which, being publicly employed on such an occasion, could not have been entirely unknown. And this old Saxon chronicler has more than once shown in the course of his work, that he himself was no stranger to the Scriptures, thus implying that those for whom he wrote at least knew that there was such a book as the Bible, and that, when they read in the Chronicle how the church warden Wyar, in the year 1070, carried away by night from the monastery of Peterborough all that he could, *gospels*, mass robes, cassocks, etc., they did not run to the abbot or sacristan asking what in the world was meant by *gospels*. Yet ordinary curiosity would have prompted the poor, ignorant creatures to do so, had the cruel Pope already consigned the Scriptures to the grave of oblivion.

We are further informed[2] that about 1120 the community belonging to the Convent of Saint Edmondsbury, in Suffolk, had determined to have a grand copy of the Bible written and illuminated, though nothing is said by Warton or any one else about the disinterment of

[1] *Dark Ages*, p. 211.

[2] Ibid., p. 494.

the forgotten document. And the services of "one Master Hugh, no doubt an expert scribe, were secured. But no material was found in that part of the country good enough to transcribe thereon the Word of God, or to display the perfection which Hugh had attained in his profession. So a superior article of parchment or vellum was ordered from Scotland, and the grand Bible was written, much, of course, to the chagrin of the churlish Pope."

How the enlightened people of England could so long stand those stupid emissaries of the Pope, the bishops, who carried out the order of their foreign master prohibiting the reading of the Scriptures, is more than any one in this progressive age can imagine. Only think of Wulstan, Bishop of Worcester, in the early part of the eleventh century, and a fair sample of all his Right Rev. brethren, at the time repeating the whole Psalter on his journeys, to keep his attendant clerks from such vain talk as is the common snare of travellers, and, whether "lying, standing, walking, sitting, having always a psalm on his lips, always Christ in his heart."[1] All this, remember, to show that it was sinful to read the Scriptures.

To be serious, is it any wonder, let us ask, that a minister of the church of England, after carefully examining the records of the so called *Dark Ages*, should say:[2] "I do not recollect any instance in which it is recorded that the Scriptures, or any part of them, were treated with indignity or with less than profound respect. I know of no case in which they were intentionally defaced or destroyed (except, as I have just stated, for their rich covers), though I have met with, and hope to produce several instances, in some of which they were the only, and in others almost the only books which were preserved through the revolutions of the monasteries to which they belonged, and all the ravages of fire,

[1] *Dark Ages*, p. 460. [2] Ibid., p. 220.

pillage, carelessness, or whatever else had swept away all the others. I know . . . . of nothing which would lead me to suppose that any human craft or power was exercised to prevent the reading, the multiplication, the diffusion of the Word of God"? We have now seen, with the aid of Protestant writers, that when England was Catholic she revered and adorned the Bible as an unsullied bride. And we have already found by the combined testimony of Catholic and Protestant critics, that since England turned Protestant, the life of the Bible there has been that of a harlot. But it is not true that the Bible has at any time been treated in that country as if already a corpse or a tenant of the tomb.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

THE READING OF THE SCRIPTURES, WHETHER IN THE ORIGINAL OR MODERN LANGUAGES, NEVER GENERALLY PROHIBITED BY THE CHURCH. BUT IN PARTICULAR CASES A LOCAL PROHIBITION TO THAT EFFECT WAS SOMETIMES NECESSARY.

It may be that no translation of the Scriptures was written for a long time in England after the tenth century. But even if such had been the case, it would, it seems, be very easy to account for it by the character of the times and the rapid changes through which the vernacular was passing. For from almost the middle of the ninth century until late in the thirteenth, the state of affairs in England was such as to seriously interfere with literary pursuits of any kind. Thus, from the former period until near the close of the eleventh century, the inroads of the Danes had been frequent, widespread, and most disastrous. Pagans to a man almost as long as their inroads continued, they seem to have been actuated on those occasions by a ferocious hatred of everything Christian; whenever the spirit of conquest or the hope of plunder attracted them to England, they, as far as their ravages extended, burned churches and monasteries, not even sparing the lives of the inoffensive inmates found in the latter, or of the wretched inhabitants who fled to the former for safety. Churches, especially those which ranked as cathedrals, and monasteries, were the sources of whatever culture and learn-

ing England possessed at the time. Their destruction, a calamity of frequent occurrence at that period, must have effectually checked, at least for a time, all literary enterprise on the part of those whose duty it was to promote the cause of general enlightenment.

Long, however, before the Danes had abandoned all hope of establishing themselves in England, that country was invaded by the Normans, in 1066; and in the bloody battle of Hastings, which was fought soon after, Harold, the English monarch, lost his life, William, surnamed the Conqueror, won a crown, and the Saxon population was placed at the mercy of an alien race. From that moment may be dated the first step towards the extinction of the Saxon language, already modified to some extent by that of the Danes. It was still spoken, of course, by the natives. But Norman-French, the language of the conquerors, was employed in the laws of the realm, the proceedings of parliament, the royal palace, and the courts of justice. At last the two languages, like the races that spoke them, coalesced, and the result has been modern English; a plant which, however, had to pass through several stages of development before it attained its present growth. In fact, though its origin may be traced away back to the middle of the thirteenth century, it was not until the sixteenth that it was so far improved as to be intelligible to those who read or write it at the present day. The dialect spoken in England from the middle of the twelfth to the middle of the thirteenth century has so many characteristics of Saxon and English, that it is called semi-Saxon by philologists. It is therefore evident, that for several centuries after the Norman conquest the language spoken by the people was in a state of transition, so that books in that language, though understood by those living when they were written, could be of little use to any one a century or even half a century later, while

the idioms were so varied, that writings originating in one part of the country were more or less unintelligible in another. Translations of the Bible, if then made, must have rapidly superseded each other.

Certainly, no trace has yet been found of an English translation of the Scriptures belonging to any date between the end of the tenth and the close of the thirteenth century. But that, especially in view of the general destruction, to which all Catholic writings, theological or Scriptural, were consigned at the Reformation, not to speak of the previous accidents to which they were exposed, by no means proves that no such translation had been made. And much less is it a reason why we should suspect that Mr. Maitland's memory deceived him, or that his researches among the ecclesiastical records of England were incomplete, when as a result of these researches he announced: "I do not recollect any instance in which it is recorded, that the Scriptures or any part of them were treated . . . . with less than profound respect."[1] And we are to remember that he wishes every general statement or remark that he may offer to be applied to the period extending from A.D. 800 to A.D. 1200, without, however, considering himself precluded from the use of earlier or later records; and that his records refer generally to Western Europe as well as to England.[2] Besides, to assert or insinuate, that, because not a fragment remains to prove that any translation of the Bible was made for several centuries after the tenth, the Scriptures were then buried in oblivion, is not only contradicted but refuted by a recent Protestant writer of England,[3] who, after stating what every one knows, "that the vernacular tongue of the country (England) had been so altered by its contact with the French spoken by the upper classes as to make new translations of the Scripture necessary" (this re-

[1] *Dark Ages, p.* 220. [2] Ibid, p. 5. [3] Rev. J. H. Blunt, *English Bible.*

mark refers to the period between the Conquest and the time of Wyckliffe), appeals to the authority of Cranmer, More, and Fox, [1] to show that such translations were actually written.

No more unfounded statement was ever advanced than the one we are combating. It was quite easy for the writer who made it to have filled up his chasm with Saxon versions, some of which must have been used long after the tenth century, or with the always numerous copies of the Vulgate in Latin, a language with which at the time all educated persons in England, as elsewhere, were more or less familiar. Had this pile of pure Biblical material been insufficient for his purpose, the writer certainly had at hand a vast accumulation consisting of other materials, such as Missals, Commentaries, Homilies, Rituals, Pontificals, etc., all teeming with the Scriptures, and, even though no better than trash in his eyes, yet, being intensely Biblical, really good enough for closing the gaping chasm his imagination has conjured up. Strange that, while studying the ecclesiastical history of his country, it never occurred to him, that the chasm in question, if not closed or cleared in any other way, could at least be spanned with such illustrious men as Lanfranc, Anselm, Langton, all primates of England, Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, John of Salisbury, Richard of St. Victor, a Scotchman, and other eminent British scholars, who flourished between the tenth and thirteenth centuries. Was it possible, that the Scriptures could have been buried in oblivion, while such ecclesiastics shed a lustre on the country of their birth or adoption by the sanctity of their lives, by the extent of their learning, and by their devotion to the spiritual interests of those over whom they had been placed as pastors? Surely, Grosseteste, who in his time was remarkable for the care with which he watched over his flock, and so

[1] *Vide supra*, *p.* 470.

distinguished for learning, that Roger Bacon declared him perfect in divine and human knowledge,[1] would not have allowed the Scriptures to be utterly forgotten. A prelate who, like him, endeavored to preserve from oblivion, or at least to bring to the knowledge of Western Christendom, the apocryphal *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, by translating it into Latin,[2] was not the man to permit the canonical Scriptures to be treated with indifference or lost sight of by his people. In this connection it is also worthy of remark, that the division of the Bible into chapters has been attributed to two of the other prelates just named—Lanfranc and Langton. Bale, Protestant bishop of Ossory, we are told by a Protestant critic,[3] "with great appearance of probability ascribes these divisions to Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury." And although it is now generally admitted that the real author of that arrangement was Cardinal Hugo de Sancto Caro,[4] about the middle of the thirteenth century, the fact that Bale, who preceded Horne about three centuries, supposed that an archbishop of Canterbury, before the end of the period included in Horne's chasm, felt sufficient interest in the Scriptures to divide them into chapters, or was competent for such a task, proves that, when Bale wrote, no Protestant suspected that there had been in the ecclesiastical history of England a period of several centuries, commencing with the end of the tenth, during which the Scriptures were buried in oblivion. Anselm, John of Salisbury, Richard of St. Victor, like the three just mentioned, and not a few others belonging to the period between the tenth and thirteenth centuries, all of whom were either born in Great Britain or spent a great part of their lives there, have left behind them works which fully attest, that the Bible was with all of them a favorite

[1] Lingard, *Hist. of England*, vol. ii., p. 248. [2] Kitto's *Cycl.*, vol. II., p. 631.
[3] Ibid., p. 717. [4] Prideaux, *Con.*, vol. I., p. 276.

study. In fact, while looking over their works, any reader cannot but be convinced, that the principal object which they had in view, as writers, was very generally the elucidation of the sacred text, as a means of propagating divine truth and promoting the cause of Christian morals. To insinuate that the Scriptures were treated by such men, or by those over whom they had any control, that is, the entire population of England, with less than profound respect, is an outrage on common sense and a libel on the illustrious dead.

But it was not enough to cooly assume that the Scriptures in England "were buried in oblivion" for several centuries after the tenth; the blame for that dreadful state of affairs must be laid at the door of "the Papal See." This statement is even more gratuitous than the other, which finds a semblance of probability in the actual absence of any vestige of a translation made within three centuries after the tenth, whereas, as we shall see, it was not until the fifteenth century that the reading of translations of the Scriptures into the vernacular of the English was forbidden. And when the prohibition to that effect was issued, it was not aimed at all translations in general, but a certain class deservedly suspected, and was, besides, the work of an English council, not a decree of "the Papal See."

In fact, there is nothing whatever to warrant the statement now under consideration, except the policy alleged by a certain class of writers to have been pursued by Innocent III., who was Pope from 1198 to 1216. But from no act or word of that great Pontiff can it be shown, that the *general* reading of the Scriptures was *prohibited* by him. Indeed, the charge, if made against any Pope, is false. But let us examine the grounds on which it is urged, particularly against Innocent. It appears that the year after the election of Innocent, the Bishop of Metz wrote to him, complaining that some

persons in his diocese, having procured a French translation of the Gospels, the Epistles of St. Paul, the Psalter, and the commentaries of St. Gregory the Great on the Book of Job, met in secret, men and women, for the purpose of reading and explaining the Scriptures and expounding the mysteries of the faith; and that they treated with contempt the ecclesiastics, who declined to take any part in their clandestine proceedings. Such are the principal points dwelt on by Innocent[1] in his answer to the Bishop. Innocent, "Though" holding (we use his own words) that "the desire to know the Scripture and receive edification from reading it is laudable," expresses his displeasure at the manner in which it was done in this instance, and disapproves of "simple and ignorant persons" attempting to explain the mysteries of the faith, "since it is not given to every one to understand them," or to interpret the "Sacred Scriptures," which "conceal a sense so profound" that "even the learned do not always succeed in expounding it." He also recommends the Bishop to communicate his instructions to those for whom they were intended, to ascertain the author of the translation, the motives that led to its execution, as well as the use that was made of it, and to forward to himself a report on the subject. What the result was, we are not informed. Opposition to legitimate authority seems to have ceased, as there is no further reference to the matter. At all events, there is nothing in the proceedings, from beginning to end, so far as can now be known, to justify any writer in asserting that the reading of the Scriptures in the vulgar or original tongues was then "prohibited by the Papal See."

But it is hardly necessary for a Catholic writer to undertake the task of vindicating the conduct of Innocent, in connection with the affair of Metz. For that has been

[1] Tom. I., Epist. 141, 142.

done in a way to silence his accusers by Dr. Frederic von Hurter, minister of the Calvinistic church at Schaffhausen, Switzerland, a writer whose studies in this and other departments of ecclesiastical history contributed to his renunciation of the heresy in which he had been educated. This distinguished scholar, reviewing the correspondence to which we have just referred, says, "Without regard to the epoch when these letters were written, they have been considered as an evidence of a spirit hostile to the light. They have been appealed to for the purpose of proving that the Pope sought to proscribe the study of the holy Scripture. But the letter addressed to the inhabitants of Metz, and many others already cited, sufficiently prove that, instead of proposing to himself such an object, he wished on the contrary that the faithful should be instructed by means of the Holy Scripture. He did not disapprove so much of the translation into the vulgar tongue, as of an attempt made by an unknown hand, unprovided with the ability and necessary right to execute it. If we nevertheless reflect on the profound veneration entertained then for the Holy Scripture, considered as the Divine Word, the scruple expressed by Innocent regarding this translation should appear to us by no means blamable. Besides, when we consider that those who attacked the Church often availed themselves of the sacred text badly understood or falsely interpreted, we shall no longer be surprised at the declaration of the Pope, especially if we reflect on his duties as head of Christendom,—duties which impose on him the task of guarding the integrity of the Sacred Word."[1] Dr. Hurter's conclusion that Innocent's disapprobation had not for its object a translation in the vulgar tongue, but the justly suspicious origin of a particular translation in the same vulgar tongue, is corroborated by the fact that, as we shall see,

[1] *Geschichte Papst Innocenz des Dritten und seiner Zeit-genossen*, B. 13.

translations of the Scriptures in that very tongue had been made long before, as they are still made, without any protest or remonstrance from, but rather with the knowledge and consent of the actual occupant of "the Papal See."

As we are engaged on the policy pursued by Innocent in relation to an obscure class of errorists, who appeared in the early part of his pontificate, this seems the proper place for a brief reference to his treatment of the Albigensians at a later period, as it constitutes the principal count in the indictment of which his accusers have made him the object. Of the Albigensians little may be said here. They are charged, and not unjustly, with grave crimes, as well as grave errors, which had already resulted in grave disorders, and if unchecked were certain to lead to more disastrous consequences. Innocent, desirous of recalling them to a sense of duty by gentle means, commissioned some monks to undertake their conversion by instructing them in the principles of Christian belief and practice. But their labors not having been blessed with the success which was expected, they were succeeded by two papal legates, who, barefoot and practising Apostolic poverty, travelled up and down the country inhabited by the Albigensians, endeavoring to reform the obstinate sectarists by word and example. At last, one of the legates having been brutally assassinated by the agents of these desperate fanatics, the crisis demanded the application of drastic measures, as religion and society had to be saved at any cost. So Innocent seems to have thought, and the war commenced. The crusade, as the struggle was called, ended with the overthrow of the Albigensians and their protectors. While it lasted, frightful excesses are said to have been committed, which, though common to both sides, stained the glory of those who professed to fight as champions of the faith. When Innocent heard of these excesses, he

was oppressed with grief at the thought that such deeds of violence should have been committed in the name of religion. Nor could it have been any mitigation of his sorrow to reflect, that both sides were responsible for the atrocities which disgraced the sanguinary contest.

Dr. Hurter here may be allowed to determine the degree of responsibility which attaches to Innocent for the manner in which the crusade was conducted. "Although (says this disinterested critic) great excesses may have been committed in the South of France against humanity and justice, in the course of these six years, and although the forces sent thither to re-establish the authority of the Church carried on instead a war of indiscriminate rapine, still Innocent cannot be held responsible for either. His orders were not carried out, and he was led by false reports to take measures which he would never have taken, had he known the true state of affairs." [1]

Mr. Horne,[2] who in this instance adopts the statement of Hallam,[3] informs his readers, that "the Council of Toulouse, in 1229, prohibited the laity from possessing the Scriptures, and this prohibition was frequently repeated upon subsequent occasions." It is certainly true that the council of Toulouse, which, however, was no more than a diocesan, or at most a provincial synod, whose decrees were purely local in their range, did prohibit the reading of the Scripture in the vulgar tongue by the laity, except the Psalter, Breviary, and Office of Our Blessed Lady. But why? As the only means of checking the spread of those dangerous principles professed by the Albigensians, and of preventing the criminal excesses to which the history of the times shows that those principles inevitably led. The sectarists, whose conduct was the occasion of this prohibition, had

[1] Innocent III., vol. II., p. 692.
[2] *Bibliographical App.*, p. 56.
[3] *The Middle Ages*, ch. ix., Part. II., p. 573.

obtained a French translation of the Scriptures prepared expressly for the purpose of sanctioning their dangerous tenets and countenancing their unlawful proceedings. To the civil and ecclesiastical authorities it appeared that the only remedy for the evil was to prohibit the circulation of the Bible in the vernacular, and it yet remains to be proved that they were mistaken. All men have certain rights, but when any class exercises these rights, (even that of reading the Scriptures, if they claim it), in such a way as to infringe on the rights of others, or imperil the peace of the community, they cannot complain, if society, for its own safety, abridges these rights by withdrawing such of them as they insist on exercising in a manner detrimental to it or to those whom it is bound to protect in the lawful and orderly exercise of their rights. It is possible the disturbances at Toulouse might have been dealt with in a more gentle and tolerant style. But this point is one about which a Catholic need feel no concern. It is enough for him to know that the prohibition in question, so far from affecting the Church universal, only applied to a single province in France, and even there ceased to be enforced when the circumstances which led to its adoption no longer existed. This remark is also applicable to the action taken at a council held at Tarragona, in Spain, in the year 1234, when the reading of the Scriptures in the vernacular was also forbidden for similar reasons. But it was not until the fifteenth century, that any decree of the kind was published in England, and then only as a means of suppressing the dangerous spirit excited by Lollardism, the turbulent offspring of the notorious Wyckliffe. The year 1408, in fact, marks the earliest date at which any action was taken by the ecclesiastical authorities in England with the purpose of formally forbidding the laity to read *unapproved* translations of the Scripture. In that year a

synod was convened at Oxford under the presidency of Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, in which the version infected with the errors of Wyckliffe was condemned, and it was further decreed, that no one should in future without license translate the Scripture into the vernacular, or read a translation in the vernacular, "until," as Labbe[1] according to Ubaldi[2] has it, "such translation shall have been approved by the ordinary of the place, or, if it be necessary, by a provincial council." That Arundel himself approved the reading of the *Scriptures* by the laity, provided the copy was authentic, appears from the fact, that in 1394, while preaching a funeral oration over "the good Queen Ann" of Bohemia, consort of Richard II., he praised her for her diligence in reading the four Gospels in English.

It thus appears that all along in England the laity had enjoyed unrestricted the liberty of reading the Scriptures in those translations which, as we have seen, they always had at hand. And it is certain they never would have been denied the privilege, had it not been that already spurious Bibles, intended to corrupt their faith, were being hawked among them, unable as many of them were to distinguish between the genuine article and its many counterfeits. Indeed, the English Catholics still possess and exercise the right of reading approved translations of the Bible, as their fathers did before them, and will to the end of time. And we may be sure that all intelligent and well disposed persons among the latter when they understood that it was unlawful to read versions issued by Wyckliffe and his followers, treated the decree on the subject with profound respect. For it is not pretended that Wyckliffe was a great saint or a great scholar. But if he had been both, no man in his senses would have said then or would say now, that his intepretation of the Bible was to be preferred to that of the universal

[1] Tom. xi., pag. 2095. [2] *Introd. in S. Script.*, iii., 462.

Church. Otherwise, we would have to hold that an exposition of the Civil Constitution by any smart lawyer might be of more weight than one sanctioned by the entire Judiciary.

It is evident that the regulations made regarding the reading of the Scriptures by the councils referred to above, were adopted under very exceptional circumstances, were applied to particular localities, and were intended to correct what were considered flagrant evils by all except a comparatively small class of persons, with whom those evils originated, or by whom they were encouraged. So far, however, the Church as such had declined to place any general restriction on the reading of approved versions in any language by the laity, or to take any action implying regret that she had all along encouraged the practice. Yet it cannot be doubted that, had she believed the interests of Christendom required it, she could have withheld the Scriptures in any form from the laity. They can claim from her only what is necessary to save their souls, and as the reading of the Scriptures is not necessary for this purpose, many at all times having gone to heaven without a Bible, and many, who had one and read it, having failed to reach there, the laity would be deprived of nothing that they are entitled to, were she to forbid them the reading of the Divine Word, and confine herself to its exposition, oral teaching, the celebration of public worship, and the administration of the sacraments. Would it not be difficult to prove, that the Apostles did anything more than this for the salvation of the laity? The New Testament is the only volume which they, so far as we know, have written, and several among them contributed nothing to it. But neither these nor the authors of the volume appear to have considered it necessary to leave a copy of it, or of the Old Testament, with each of their converts. In fact, without a miracle

they could not have done so, and nobody supposes that any such miracle was ever wrought by them, though miracles were plenty enough at the time. The Church, however, never withheld from the laity the privilege of reading the Bible in the vernacular, for she has always believed that, when not abused, the exercise of the privilege is calculated to edify and enlighten the mind, as well as to promote the cause of virtue. But when Bibles in which the original text is wilfully corrupted, and its meaning is wilfully perverted for sectarian purposes, as was the case with those peddled around by the Albigensians in France, the Lollards in England, and the Jews in Spain[1] as well as the Lutherans in Germany, they are to be classified as false and dangerous books. And any pastor of souls is bound to forbid the reading of them by his flock. Even a Protestant minister would be regarded as unfaithful to the duties for which he is paid by his employers, were he to allow what he considers corrupt copies of the Scripture to be introduced among his congregation. And it is well known that such of these employers as insist on the reading of the Bible in the common school of which they happen to be directors (and who among them in such a position does not include this juvenile exercise in the curriculum?), would permit the teacher to substitute the Douay for the Jacobite Bible, even though the teacher and the majority of the pupils might prefer the former. In acting thus, the poor man invested with a little brief authority believes he is doing right, though he dare not swear to it, if his idea of an oath is that of most Christians. Yet he is horrified at hearing that this or that priest has condemned the use of the Protestant Bible in the public schools; and when told that the priest, who fully comprehends the nature of an oath, is prepared to swear that the Protestant Bible cannot be

[1] Balmes *Catholicity and Protestantism Compared*, p. 215.

read without sin by a Catholic, instead of suspecting that he himself may be mistaken, our autocrat of the common school is only further horrified on being so informed.

But it could not well be otherwise among that class of the Christian laity to which this specimen of modern enlightenment belongs, inheriting as it does the principles and traditions of the Reformation, and taught to believe that its Bible is the best book that was ever printed, and the truest version of the original Scriptures that was ever written, if not an actual apograph of these Scriptures or the very autograph of their inspired authors. Many of those, who rank as leaders of this Christian laity, know better, for they are cognizant of all the facts by which it has already been shown,[1] that, while that version abounds in wilful perversions of the sacred text, and of gross misconceptions of its meaning, "no wilful perversion of its meaning has ever been brought home" to those who wrote the Douay Bible. Those leaders also know, what most of their followers appear to be ignorant of, that those Protestants, whose zeal is only equalled by their wealth, and who, persuaded that the reading and possession of the Scripture is indispensable to the propagation and maintenance of Christianity, have expended millions upon millions in distributing the Scriptures all over the world, yet have never been able to reach an agreement regarding the Bible to be approved for the use of the heathen abroad and the pagans at home. Nevertheless the said leaders are as ready as those whom they guide, to frown down, wherever they have the control, any attempt to substitute another English version for what is now known as King James's Bible, or to dispense with the latter altogether in public institutions. To them, as to the rank and file of their followers, there is nothing in heaven

[1] Chapters xx.–xxiii.

above, or on the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth, equal to the authorized version. So they say, and so they write, yet knowing all the while, that that version bristles with blunders and corruptions, some few of which, for shame's sake, a recent commission tried to remove, but current editions still retain; and that the Bible societies could never be induced to unite in adopting a common standard copy of the Scriptures for promoting the object of their organization—the conversion of the entire world to that extremely mutable and indefinable religious system implied in the word *Protestantism.* If those Bible Societies have, as Mr. Marshall has shown in his incomparable work on *Christian Missions*, been a good deal less successful in the salvation of souls than in the expenditure of vast sums, and the gratuitous distribution of millions of Bibles and religious tracts often consigned to all such purposes for which waste paper is useful, they have at least been quite serviceable in convincing the world, that Protestants find it as difficult to agree on adopting a common standard of the Bible as in uniting in the profession of a common creed. A word or two is, therefore, now called for in reference to the origin, object, and operations of Bible Societies.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

The Bible Societies and the Apocryphal War.

It was not until near the end of the seventeenth century, that any thing was done by English Protestants to shake off the religious lethargy into which they had sunk, when the civil and ecclesiastical commotions consequent on the Reformation had subsided. About that period efforts were made to re-awaken some religious feeling in the population, great numbers of which were probably Christian in nothing but the name. Books of instruction and other means, including the circulation of the Scriptures, were employed for the purpose, with the aid and under the direction of societies which the circumstances had called into existence. But it was not until 1804, that what was then called and is still known as *the British and Foreign Bible Society* was organized in London, for the exclusive purpose of promoting the circulation of the Protestant Bible at home and abroad. Auxiliary societies were soon formed in other parts of Great Britain. And in a short time similar organizations, with numerous branches, were established at several points on the continent of Europe. In the United States the first Bible Society was founded in 1808, an example which in the course of time was followed by several of the principal cities in this country. From the following statistics the reader may form an estimate of the total receipts and expenditures of these societies since their organization. But if he wishes to

know what has been accomplished by them, or what use is generally made of the Bibles and religious tracts which they dispose of, and especially such as they distribute gratuitously, he will have to consult Mr. Marshall's *Christian Missions*, a work by James Laird Patterson,[1] or some other book by a disinterested writer, who refers to the subject even only incidentally.

In one year, for example, that of 1874, the receipts of *the British and Foreign Bible Society* from all sources were £ 217,390,—13s. 1d.—something more than a million dollars, its disbursements during that time amounting to about twenty-five thousand dollars less. In the same year there were issued from the Society's depots at home and abroad 2,619,427 Bibles, Testaments, and detached books of the Bible. The number of such publications during the first 30 years of its existence was almost 74 millions, involving an expenditure of about $ 38,750,000. The receipts of *the American Bible Society* during the year ending May 1888 were $ 523,910.50, the expenses in that year being $ 499,998.75. In the same year there were 1,274,036 copies of the Scriptures printed and purchased by the Society. 904,179 volumes were issued from the Bible house, and 533,261 in foreign lands, making a total of 1,437,440. Of these, 369,714 were Bibles; 598,515, New Testaments; and 469,211, portions of the Bible. There have been 584,603 Bibles, Testaments, and portions circulated in foreign lands. During the seventy years in which the American Society has been in existence previous to 1888, its issues amount to 46,877,646. For the distribution of its publications, at home and abroad, the Society both here and in England employs a large corps of agents, preachers, missionaries, pedagogues, colporteurs, etc., in whose support, as well as in the publication and transport of its Bibles,

[1] *Journal of a Tour in Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and Greece.* The tourist left England a Puseyite, and returned a Catholic.

Testaments, and religious tracts, its revenue is expended, which revenue is derived from the sale of its issues, from the contributions of its members, from collections among Protestant congregations, and from numerous bequests; while the enthusiastic patrons, instead of expressing surprise at the little that has been done with so much money, still cherish the hope that the millennium is at hand, and the whole world about to be converted to what they understand by *the Religion of the Bible*. Both having the same object in view, and employing generally the same means to obtain it, there may have been a bond of sympathy between the *British and Foreign Bible Society* and *the American Bible Society*, but apparently none whatever between these two on the one hand, and *the American and Foreign Bible Society* on the other, though its object is the same as theirs. It owes its origin to a secession of the Baptists from the American Bible Society, and was established in 1837, but had its own ranks thinned by a secession in 1850, when a number of members withdrew and organized *the American Bible Union*. This comprised mainly Baptists, having members not only in many parts of the United States, but in Canada, Great Britain, and generally wherever the English language is spoken. The receipts, and of course the expenditures, as well as the operations of these two societies, which originated in a secession, have fallen far short of the astounding figures reached by *the British and Foreign Bible Society* and *the American Bible Society*. The cause of this disunion among brethren will be explained further on. Here it may be remarked, that if one were to express correctly the feeling existing between the two former societies, or between them and the two latter, he would probably have to select a much stronger word than emulation.

It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that, when the first Bible Society was formed in England for the

sole purpose of circulating at home the authorized version of the Scriptures in the languages of the United Kingdom, and abroad the best ancient and received versions, or, when it is necessary and practicable, new translations from the Hebrew and Greek, the project was universally approved by Protestants. For it failed to receive the sanction of several Anglican bishops and ministers, among whom may be mentioned Marsh, Bishop of Peterborough. These, dreading the effect which association with dissenters would produce on members of the Establishment, condemned the fundamental law of the Society, according to which its Bibles were to be published without note or comment, and, besides, insisted that the Book of Common Prayer should be given along with the Bible. Many also complained of the serious errors said to have been made in several of the translations. The rigorists also demanded that all who deny the doctrines of the Trinity should be excluded from the society, and this, being refused, led to the formation of what is known as *The Trinitarian Society*, whose field of operations has been comparatively limited. In fact, the Protestant Bible Society has exhibited the same tendency to divide and subdivide which has been a characteristic of the Protestant religion throughout its entire history. The British and Foreign Bible Society also met with decided opposition among some leading Protestants in Germany. Bretschneider, superior councillor of the consistory, and other Protestant divines condemned its methods. But, strange to say while the Society in England and on the Continent had to contend with the opposition offered by members of the Protestant ministry, it received what to it must have been unexpected encouragement from a few Catholics in Germany, among whom Leander Van Ess, a professor in the university of Marburg, where he was also parish priest, attained rather unenviable notoriety by the views

which he published on the subject. But these views, as well as the arguments by which he endeavored to confirm them, were condemned and refuted by Binterim Kistemacher and other learned Catholic writers among his own countrymen. As a reward for his services to them, even the friends of the Bible Society in the end referred to him in language savoring much more of displeasure and censure than of gratitude and admiration. [1]

In the account so far given of the Bible Societies, a Catholic will perceive that they early exhibited symptoms which called forth the interference of the Supreme Pastor. That interference was never withheld on any occasion when there was reason to apprehend danger to the faith from that quarter. Thus these societies were condemned by Pius VII., in a Brief dated 29 June 1816 and addressed to the Bishop of Gnesen; and condemned a second time by the same Pontiff on September 3d of the same year, in another Brief addressed to the Bishop of Mohilew. The condemnation was renewed by Leo XII., in an Encyclical of May 3, 1824, and renewed again in an Encyclical by Pius VIII., dated May 24, 1829. Gregory XVI issued a similar condemnation in an Encyclical dated May 8, 1844; and on November 9, 1846, Pius IX. reiterated the condemnation pronounced by so many of his predecessors. We shall see, as we proceed, that besides those dangerous tendencies of the Bible Societies which the preceding remarks have brought to view, there were others exhibited by those associations so opposed to the integrity of the Sacred Scripture and the purity of divine faith, as to compel the sternest denunciation from the highest tribunal in the Church.

We have seen already, while enumerating the French, Spanish, and Portuguese Catholic versions, which were published under the auspices of the Bible Societies in

[1] Vide Morrison's "Preface to New Edition of Alexander's Canon of Script.," p. xv.

the United States, that all the notes and comments belonging to those versions were omitted. Wiecki's Polish Catholic version, as well as the others, was treated in the same way in Europe according to Ubaldi,[1] who remarks further, that in all the editions of Catholic versions which were issued by the Bible Societies the deutero books were excluded from the Old Testament, the object, of course, being to persuade Catholics, among whom the agents of the Societies scattered their vitiated Bibles, that each reader had the right to interpret the sacred text as he pleased, and was not to consider the deutero books of the Old Testament parts of the inspired volume. This of itself fully warranted the condemnation of the Holy See. These misguided zealots would have informed any one about to learn a trade or a profession, that, besides the tools the use of which he had to learn, or the books the contents of which he had to read, he also required an instructor. But in the matter of religion, the most difficult as well as the most important of all pursuits, they acted on the erroneous assumption that no instructor was necessary. There was the Bible, not by any means a full, clear, and methodical treatise on the science of religion, and still less so as the Bible Societies made it. But according to them, to be a full-fledged Christian, a man had nothing to do but read it!

Besides, whether it was that the scholars they employed for the purpose were incompetent or dishonest, the translations which were made by order of the Societies were, as many Protestants have admitted, some of them inaccurate: but not only that, they were often ludicrous, and in some instances so repugnant to Christian feeling, that they might well be characterized blasphemous. This last remark is fully justified by the extracts which a contributor to the *Dublin Review*[2] has

[1] *Introd. in S. Scrip.*, III., 488.

[2] Vol. XLL., article v.

made from these translations. But how could it have been otherwise, when men claiming to be the cream of Christendom scrupled not to circulate as the Word of God translations made after the following method, a method, there is reason to believe, employed in other countries besides that in which it is stated to have been actually made use of. In India, when it is proposed by the Baptists to translate the Scriptures into the various languages of that country, several *Pandits*, or men conversant with these languages, are assembled in the hall of the establishment belonging to the missionaries of Singapore. There the *Pandits* are placed in a circle, the centre of which is occupied by a *Pandit* versed in Hindostanee, a language, with which the others are supposed to be familiar, and in English, of which the *Pandit* himself ought to have a profound knowledge. As soon as the Mahratta, Seikh, Guzarat, Orissa, Burmah, etc., *Pandits* have prepared their writing materials, a missionary, or any other European or Anglo-Asiatic, reads word by word a verse in the English text, and the verse thus read word by word is repeated word by word in Hindostanee by the *Pandit* in the centre, and as he does so, the other *Pandits* around him put it down word by word, each in his own language or particular dialect; and in this way the translation is completed.[1]

The Bible Societies exultingly boast that they have translated the Scriptures into more than two hundred languages and dialects. But there is nothing in this to be proud of or to boast about, rather much, very much, to inspire with shame and confusion all who have in any way contributed to such outrages on God's holy word. Besides, the patrons of these Societies have good reason to ask why, when such a handy way of translating the Bible has been invented, there is not already, after eighty-four years of unremitting effort and lavish expenditure,

[1] Cornely, *Introd. in S. Script.*, I, 495.

a version of the Scripture in every language, dialect, idiom, and jargon now spoken by mankind? But seriously, can the reader look for any other result than that many of the translations prepared by the Bible Societies are calculated to provoke ridicule among people of common sense, and indignation among those who duly revere the Divine Scriptures, at the manner in which the Bible has been burlesqued so long and so often in recent times by its professed friends; and not only burlesqued by these friends, but exposed by them still to profanation at the hands of the heathen, a charge long ago brought and proved against them by Mr. Marshall.[1] For at this writing it is stated in the New York press[2] that "In many parts of China, the Bibles given by the missionaries are used in the manufacture of cheap boot soles." Their history proves that our dissenting brethren have never been able to agree in professing a common symbol of belief. That history also demonstrates, that they are as incapable of uniting in the acceptance of a common Bible. For most of the schisms, which divided into opposing sections the associations formed for the purpose of disseminating the Scriptures, originated in a difference of views regarding the Bible which was to be adopted as a standard. In fact, it was for this reason that the Baptists, for instance, as we have seen, separated from the primitive organization and established what they named "The American and Foreign Bible Society." In this case the parent society, called "The American Bible Society," had refused aid to the Bengalee and Burmese versions, because its Baptist members, desiring to have these versions consistent with Baptist principles, had translated *baptize* by a word representing *immerse*. A secession by the Baptists followed, they very justly supposing, that they had as good a right to

[1] *Christian Missions.*

[2] *Tribune*, of 1889, cited by Erie *Herald*, May 24, 1889.

thus inoculate with their principles the natives of India, as King James's translators had to inoculate in the same way the people of Great Britain with their own compromised opinions. Not long ago the latter translation was, as we know, revised by committees of English and American scholars determined to adhere to it as an English standard copy of the Scriptures. So the strenuous leaders of the Baptist persuasion, believing that they, too, should have a revision of the English Protestant Bible, actually undertook one. Indeed, the work is already far advanced, and when completed will no doubt differ very essentially from the copy which most other Protestants follow as a rule of belief. The quarrel is an unseemly one, but it had and will have the effect of stimulating the brethren on both sides to greater efforts in supplying the home and the foreign market with a greater variety and a more abundant supply of Bibles. It also emphasized the fact, that the descendants of the reformers are not more divided about a creed than they are about a Bible. The unpleasant episode connected with the Baptist Bible was but the result of a principle which had already led to a far more serious controversy among the friends of the Bible in Europe, and proved that, in the Old World as well as the New, these friends found it impossible to agree on the selection of any particular Bible, whether for their own use or that of the heathen.

At the time that the British Bible Society undertook to provide all mankind with copies of what it considered the pure word of God, Protestant Bibles, particularly on the continent of Europe, generally contained the deutero books of the Old Testament under the name of Apocrypha, and inserted, though not invariably, between the Old and New Testament. For they were to be found sometimes intermingled with the others, as they are now and ever have been in Catholic Bibles. No

doubt, many English Protestant Bibles in the beginning of the present century contained those books. Indeed, there is no reason to suppose that even at this time they have entirely disappeared, though they have ceased to be printed. A place was assigned them under the title of Apocrypha in all the early English Protestant versions at the end of the Old Testament. In Matthew's Bible and Cranmer's they were even called *Hagiographa*, but as *Apocrypha* they passed into King James's version, and were generally included in all the Protestant Bibles printed in England, at least until about the close of the seventeenth century. In fact, several of these books are, so used in her public services by the Anglican Church, as to show that, whatever may be her theory regarding them, practically she recognizes no distinction between them and the rest.[1] But among the English dissenters the books in question, even if found there, were treated with no consideration. Continental Protestantism, however, excelled even conservative Anglicanism in the favorable, even reverential view, with which it regarded those books. It is true, Luther and his associates treated them as unscriptural, relegating them as Apocrypha to the end of his Old Testament. He endeavored at the same time to excite suspicion or contempt against several proto books of the Old Testament and deutero in the New. But his arbitrary proceeding in the former case was hardly less offensive, even to Lutherans, than his equally arbitrary proceeding in the latter case. Thus among Lutherans and all other sects on the continent the New Testament remained as Luther found it in the Church, and the same remark, if the common practice outside of Great Britain be meant, is applicable to the Old Testament. For the Continental Protestants had, all of them, the deutero books in their Old Testament. And though these books may there still bear the brand

[1] Vide Kitto's *Cyclop.*, I., pp. 522, 557; II., pp. 186, 876.

of *Apocrypha* with which Luther had stamped them, it may be truly said that the common people particularly, finding them in the volume which they called the Bible, received them as part of it, and therefore as sacred or canonical scripture.

But whether this be generally so now or not, Karl Hildebrand Canstein, an earnest Protestant, who died at Berlin, in 1719, after founding in Halle a Bible Society long before such an institution was thought of in England, actually mixed in the German and Bohemian Bibles, which he published at a very low price for the convenience of the people, the deutero among the proto books of the Old Testament, as if he did not himself believe and did not wish any one else to believe, that there was any difference whatever between the two classes of books. The enterprise which he started has been, it is understood, continued to the present time. And it was the Bible which he was the first to issue that the German societies affiliated to "The British and Foreign Bible Society" purchased for circulation. Thus, without any objection on the part of the Society at London, where probably the matter was regarded as unimportant, the deutero books of the Old Testament were included in the Bibles distributed throughout Germany. A knowledge of this fact, however, seems to have excited intense feeling in Scotland, and the central authority in consequence addressed, in 1811, a request to the auxiliary branches, advising them to exclude the deutero books from their Bibles. But this action gave so much offense to those affected by it, that it was soon cancelled. This vacillating policy of the parent society only served to inflame both factions more and more, without satisfying either, and led soon after to that protracted and bitter struggle between the combatants, which was known at the time as the apocryphal war. On one side it was alleged that the books in question had been trans-

lated by Protestant divines, and even appointed by the Anglican establishment to be read in the churches. On the other it was affirmed that those books were not inspired, a fact demonstrated by their contents, and consequently did not belong to the canon. To this it was replied that the catalogue of so-called canonical books was not itself inspired nor an article of faith, and that the very same objections urged against the deutero books could be turned against many of the others.

Convocation maintained a discreet and dignified silence during the long and bitter contest between the Lutheran Consistory and the Scotch Kirk. The deutero books being generally defended by representatives of the former, and opposed by champions of the latter. That contest was commenced in 1811, and was conducted with such obstinacy on the part of the defenders, and so much violence by the assailants, that disinterested spectators must have supposed, that both belligerent parties believed, that life, liberty, and independence, all that is dear in this world or precious in the next, was staked on the issue. But they were simply engaged in manufacturing conclusive testimony in order to prove to intelligent people that for Protestants to agree in saying what constitutes the Bible, is a sheer impossibility. It was also learned that for a while Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese Bibles containing the detested books were published with the permission and even assistance of the central Society. This was more than the Scotch element could stand, and a serious rupture seemed inevitable. To prevent such a calamity, it was decided that the funds of the society should be expended only in the publication of Bibles in which the disputed books were omitted, and that, if the branch societies published those books, they should do so at their own expense. The course of affairs had been for some time unfavorable to the plans of Van Ess, but this last blow was likely to upset them alto-

gether. However, he proposed to the society, that he would continue to publish his Bible, provided he received assistance, and would include in it the deutero books at his own expense. On these conditions he actually succeeded in obtaining a grant of £500 in 1824. Before he received the amount, however, the antiapocryphalists of Scotland issued a strenuous protest against such use of the Society's funds. The result was, that the act making an appropriation in favor of Van Ess's Bible was cancelled, and an acrimoneous controversy of several years followed, the stern Scotch insisting that the insertion of the Apocrypha at the end of the Old Testament, or anywhere in the Bible, even if done without any expense to the Society, was an intolerable profanation of the good book. Such eminent scholars as Bretschneider, already mentioned, Ersch, the cyclopedist, and Gruber, professor in the University of Halle, protested against the elimination of the Apocrypha. The Bible Societies at Paris, Saltzburg, Berlin, Stockholm, and Petersburgh appealed to their brethren in Great Britain for the same purpose. In vain, however; for in 1827 it was decided by the London Society, that no association or individual engaged in circulating the apocrypha should receive assistance from the society; that in order to prevent these books from being bound with the others, none but books already bound should be given to the branch societies; that these books should be distributed as received; and that societies printing the apocryphal books should place the amount granted them for bibles at the disposal of the central society. That decision, forced on the acceptance of the Bible Societies by an intolerant and fanatical faction, remains to this day as firm and binding on these organizations, as if it had emanated from a professedly infallible tribunal.

It is evident by this time that there is a marked difference, not only between the Catholic Bible and the Prot-

estant Bible, but between the treatment which the former receives among Catholics, and that which the latter experiences among Protestants. The Catholic Bible, besides having a text exempt from intentional corruptions, is complete. For we have seen, that, while no fault can be found with its New Testament, its Old Testament comprises the same books which it had when transferred from the Jewish to the Christian Church—the same books, too, which are still revered as divine by the schismatical Greek Church as well as among those old oriental sects, whose founders, long ages ago, when they separated from the centre of Christian Unity, transmitted to their descendants the collection of inspired writings, which they themselves had received on their conversion from paganism: whereas several of these books have been excluded from the canon by those western sects, which can trace their origin no farther back than the sixteenth century. The canon of all Protestant denominations is, therefore, a comparatively modern invention, which, as a doctrine, those who believe it dare not pronounce divine, or place in the same rank with those fundamental principles which they accept as articles of faith. And though the Protestant canon professes to be identical with the existing Jewish canon, and actually is so, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, it is essentially different from that canon as it stood at the commencement of the Christian era. Of this fact there can be no doubt, resting as it does on the testimony of not only early Christian writers, but ancient Rabbinical doctors who lived within the Christian period. As to the treatment which each Bible receives from its patrons, every one knows that, while the Protestant denominations scatter copies of theirs indiscriminately everywhere and among all classes, the Christian and the heathen, the old and the young, the good and the bad, the ignorant as well as the learned,—the Church, in dis-

seminating the Scriptures, is guided by certain well-known rules not arbitrarily prescribed, but dictated as well by the character of the Scriptures themselves as by the dispositions of those who are able to read them. The Scriptures being divine are holy, and are therefore to be treated as such, indeed, in a way entirely different from that in which the most valuable human compositions are handled and perused. When and where they are likely to be treated as other than sacred, or to become not a blessing, but a curse to the reader—a contingency not by any means rare, as we shall see immediately—the Church, out of respect as well for their divine character as for the spiritual interests of those who may abuse them, withholds them until the danger of desecration has passed. The bearing of the Church towards the sacred Scriptures is that of Moses, as he stood unshodden before the burning bush. But the bearing of our dissenting brethren towards their poor Bible reminds one of the feelings, with which the discomfited ancients of Israel and the sacrilegious sons of Heli, dragged the ark of the covenant into the field of battle.

CHAPTER XXXV.

EFFECTS PRODUCED BY THE INDISCRIMINATE READING OF THE PROTESTANT BIBLE.—CATHOLICS ENCOURAGED TO READ FAITHFUL VERSIONS OF THE SCRIPTURES IN VERNACULAR LANGUAGES.

In dealing with Protestants, with those facts just stated before them, no Catholic can be expected to offer an apology for the action taken by the Congregation of the Index at Rome, after the Council of Trent had closed its sessions. A plain statement of the case is sufficient. The Congregation of the Index was instituted by the Tridentine Council, and was composed of ecclesiastics selected from several countries on account of their learning and experience. It drew up, as directed, an Index, or catalogue of prohibited books, affixing thereto ten rules, and Pius IV. confirmed its proceedings in a Constitution dated May 24, 1564. The fourth rule which the Congregation adopted refers to the reading of the Bible in the vernacular, thus: "Since experience has made it manifest that the reading of the Bible in the vulgar tongue, if it is permitted to all indiscriminately, causes through the temerity of men more detriment than utility, let the judgment of the bishop or the inquisitor be followed in this matter, who, with the advice of the parish-priest or confessor, can permit the reading of those versions in the vulgar tongue that have been made by Catholic authors, to those whom they shall know to be fit to derive from this reading, not detriment, but an increase of faith and piety—and let this

permission be in writing." The observance of these rules was strictly insisted on by several Pontiffs subsequently. And in a decree by the Congregation of the Index, dated June 13, 1757, during the pontificate of Benedict XIV., it was further enacted that, "These versions of the Bible in the vulgar tongue are permitted, when they have been approved of by the Holy See, or are published with notes drawn from the Holy Fathers, or from learned Catholic writers." The rule of the Index, however, which the character of the times rendered imperatively necessary, was not everywhere enforced in all its details. And nothing more is insisted on at present, than that a version should have the approbation of the bishop of the place where it is published, and be illustrated by notes or comments from the Fathers and other competent Catholic writers.

The reader will observe, that the cause assigned for the restriction imposed on the indiscriminate writing as well as reading of versions in the vernacular languages of the time, was that experience had shown that such a practice had done more evil than good. But was it really so? No one can doubt it who examines the testimony even of the men who were the first to deluge European society with a flood of unauthorized versions of the Bible in the vulgar tongues, or applauded those who did so. Fortunately, that testimony has been preserved, in most instances, by Catholic writers, who undertook to describe the progress and effects of the Reformation, and stands uncontradicted to the present day. Among these writers may be named the late Archbishop Spalding, to whom we are indebted for a *History of the Reformation;* M. Audin, the author of a *Life of Luther*, as well as a *Life of Calvin;* Dr. Milner, who has written the well-known work on *The End of Controversy;* Döllinger, who published at Ratisbon, in 1846–48, three volumes on *The Reformation, its interior Develop-*

ment and its Effects. Most of these works, or others on the same subject, being accessible to the general reader, it is unnecessary to place them under contribution here. But no one can peruse the details which have been copied into them from the writings of the reformers and their friends, without being convinced that for a long time after the Bible, in the form given it by those men, was let loose on Germany and England, the former country was a perfect pandemonium, and the latter little better than a Bedlam—men and women running around stark mad or stark naked, Kings of Sion, Messiahs and Mothers[1] of Messiahs, libertines, scoundrels, despera-

[1] As an instance of the preposterous folly exhibited by those blasphemous fanatics and their deluded followers down to nearly our own times, may be mentioned the case of the Englishwoman, Joanna Southcott. She was a domestic servant and a member of the Established Church, having been born about 1750. In the course of time, she joined the Methodist movement, became a prophetess, and professed to be the woman spoken of in the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse. As such, though quite illiterate, she scribbled or dictated a large amount of incoherent sayings, and carried on a profitable business in the sale of *seals*, by the purchase of which heaven could be secured on certain conditions. These passports to heaven were signed in her name by an Episcopalian clegyman of noble family, who acted as her secretary, and she had authority to dispose of them to the number of 144,000. A disease to which she at last fell a victim seemed to indicate that she was pregnant, and she announced herself as the mother of the promised Shiloh. The interest and expectation of her enthusiastic followers, among whom was a large number of Protestant ministers, were excited to the highest pitch. A cradle of the most costly materials was ordered at a fashionable upholsterer's by her devoted votaries, who now amounted to about 100,000, and were determined to spare no expense in preparing for the birth of the expected Messiah. But before that wonderful event occurred, her death in London, in 1817, disappointed their hopes, and a post mortem examination showed that in her case they had mistaken dropsy for pregnancy. England and Wales still possessed some of her followers as late as 1885 (Encycl. Britt). An English lady named Essam left a large amount of money for publishing what she called the *Sacred Writings of Joanna Southcott.* The will was disputed by a niece of the testatrix as blasphemous, but was sustained by the Court of Chancery, and thus the writings of Joanna were assigned a permanent place in the literature of the nineteenth century, that posterity might know what progress in religion had been made by that part of the British population which insisted on the right to read the Bible in any version they thought proper to select.

does of either sex, and of every class and character; all, armed with the new Bibles and illuminated, as they maintained, by the Holy Spirit, bade defiance to all authority, divine as well as human. There was no sin forbidden by the decalogue, no offence against the civil law, no outrage on public decency, no absurdity opposed to common sense, of which those bibliomaniacs, miscreants, and fanatics were not guilty. All this continued until society interposed for its own preservation, and repressed by the secular arm the evils which imperilled its very existence. And all this is proved by the public records of the time, as well as by the written statements of the very men who preached the principles and peddled around the Bibles, by which so many miserable wretches were led astray. With the testimony derived from these sources most readers are familiar, as it is found in works referred to above. But we cannot dismiss this part of the subject, without citing the statement of a writer whose position, as well as the time at which he lived, enabled him to estimate fairly the consequences attendant on the indiscriminate reading of the Bible in the vulgar tongue. We refer to Brian Walton, Protestant bishop of Chester, England, and principal editor of the *London Polyglot*. He was not a man to be influenced by extreme or desponding views. Besides, his sympathies were with that form of religion, which had superseded Catholicity in England, and had given the people of that country their present version of the Bible just sixty-two years before the work appeared in which he recorded his experience of the effects produced by it. No admirer of that version can therefore object to Dr. Walton as an incompetent witness, when in the preface to his Polyglot, after stating that he undertook that work with the hope that it might contribute to extricate the English Church from the evils in which she was involved by "a crew," as he calls them, "of the most profligate im-

postors, who everywhere now pervert, distort, and arbitrarily corrupt the Divine Word, or reject it absolutely, blaspheming and flinging it away as a dead letter." He adds: "Aristarchus, of old, could hardly find seven wise men in all Greece; but amongst us, it is difficult to find the same number of fools. For they are all doctors, all inspired from above. There is not a fanatic nor a mountebank from the lowest dregs of the populace, who does not vent his ravings for the word of God. For the bottomless pit seems to be opened, and out of it ascends a smoke, which has obscured. the heavens, and from it, locusts with stings, a numerous brood of sectarists and heretics, who have revived all the ancient heresies, and added to them fresh and monstrous errors of their own. But it is well known from what quarter they have come. These are the people who have overrun cities, provinces, and entire countries. They have even taken possession of churches, and pulpits, and along with themselves have precipitated into the pit the unfortunate people, whom they have led astray."

This is strong language, yet it is but a faint echo of the lamentations, with which Luther, Melanchthon, Bucer, Brentius, Capito, and other reformers bewail the sad state of public morals brought about by the reading, and professedly by the authority, of what was then hawked about as the Word of God. It was to check such outrages on public decency and common sense, and to suppress those most flagrant crimes against society of which biblicists were guilty wherever the Reformation extended, but especially in England and Germany, that the reading of the Scriptures in the vernacular, unless done under certain conditions, was prohibited by the Church. Nor should it be forgotten, that that prohibition was aimed at versions so unfaithful to the original, that a due respect for the Divine Word, and the interest of all into whose hands they

might fall, imperatively demanded the interference of the ecclesiastical authorities. Under any circumstances, the condemnation of those versions would have been well merited, as they were palmed off on the simple and ignorant as the genuine Scriptures; whereas they were too often nothing more than dangerous counterfeits or corrupt copies of them, placed in circulation, too, for the base purpose of obtaining the apparent sanction of some inspired writer for one or other class of errors at variance with human reason as well as divine revelation.

In recent times, the inherent vagaries of the human mind, which, fostered by the reading of vicious versions of Scripture, produced such wide-spread disorder in the sixteenth and two following centuries, have been more or less held in check; not, however, because common sense had more generally re-asserted itself, nor because any considerable improvement had been made in the current versions, or that the number of their readers had been notably diminished; but because society, profiting by experience, had adopted summary means for checking any violation of the public peace, or good order in the community. All movements of the kind, even those of which the Bible is at the bottom, are now promptly counteracted by the application of Lynch law, when the outraged populace considers the ordinary process too slow and uncertain; or by trial before a judge and jury; or by a commission *de lunatico inquirendo* deriving its authority from the regular courts. Either of the two last methods of dealing with bibliomaniacs is not only more humane and Christian than the first, but is equally effective, though more expensive and less expeditious, and should be preferred in every instance. To their influence, undoubtedly, is to be attributed the comparative exemption of modern society from the turbulent and sanguinary scenes, which disgraced so long the history of those

countries that embraced the reformed religion; though the Bible reader is probably as much abroad as ever, and preposterous folly, driveling idiocy, or permanent insanity, or even a life of crime is now, as much as formerly, the risk that confronts the profession. These deplorable results of what is generally known as Bible reading are, however, much less conspicuous now than formerly, because society has decided that the victims, for themselves as well as for itself, are best disposed of, when withdrawn from all intercourse with others, and sent to the scaffold, or placed in prison, or consigned to a lunatic asylum, according as the nature of their malady may require. Yet it cannot be doubted, that a large volume might be filled with the tragical and melancholy record of all such cases as occur in any single year throughout those countries, where Bible reading is epidemic. The following facts bearing on this subject have been collected by one who is an occasional reader of the public press, but without the slightest purpose of attaching any statistical value to them, as implying anything more than that the practice of Bible reading may not unreasonably be suspected as the cause of much of the insanity, not to say crime, which prevails in the United States, where these facts occurred.

In 1879, Charles P. Freeman, of Pocasset, Mass., murdered his own child, believing that he was called to do so by what he read in his Bible. His wife coöperated in the crime, and it was approved by the Adventists, a sect to which they belonged.

In 1882, J. B. Smith, near Chisco Beach, California, under "the inspiration of God," took the life of his little son in "Abrahamic sacrifice."

In the same year, near Bloomington, Indiana, James Mink, after sharpening a butcher knife, was prevented by the interference of a neighbor from offering up in sacrifice his four-year-old boy, a deed which, after pray-

ing and reading his Bible, he believed God had directed him to commit.

In 1883, John Zempirick's wife, in Milwaukee, killed her three children, literally chopping their bodies into mince meat, and justifying the horrible crime by saying "she had read of sacrificing children in the good book."

In 1884, on the third day of September, at Reading, Pa., died May Washington, after a successful attempt at surpassing Christ's fast in the wilderness, about which she also had been reading in her Bible, of course. When she commenced the fast she weighed 275 pounds, and 100, at her death.

In 1885, an application for divorce was heard in Judge Tully's court, in Chicago. The suit was brought by Laura M., against T. Wentworth, on the ground of cruelty and infidelity. According to the lady's testimony, her husband belonged to a sect organized under the title of "The Church of the First Born of the Redeemer in Heaven and Glorified upon Earth." Besides some elsewhere in the Western States, the membership consists of about one hundred in Chicago. The head of the sect is the Rev. George Jacob Schweinfurth, of whom more immediately. It would appear that women, as well as all kinds of property, are held in common by the members. The association would therefore be, to a certain extent, a revival of the abominable community that so long outraged public decency at Oneida, New York. Sometime before Mrs. Wentworth applied for a divorce, her husband, along with herself, attended a convention of "The Church of the First Born, etc.," at a private house. The preacher wore no robes, much less the congregation, the members appearing to each other in nature's raiment only. At nightfall they herded together in a common room for repose. Wentworth, however, denied many of the charges made by his wife. It was not denied by Schweinfurth, who was in court, that Dora

Beekman, wife of a Congregationalist minister, and a member of the sect, once thought that she bore in her womb Jesus about to be born a second time, and when, like Joanna Southcott, she found that she was mistaken, she claimed to be Christ herself, and the dupes or knaves who composed her followers seemed to believe her. She had died at Byron, Illinois, the headquarters of this singular people, two years before the above facts were made public. Subsequent developments showed that after her death Schweinfurth had taken her place, and was recognized as Christ himself by his followers, who were called Beekmanites.

In 1886, the wife of Charles Lindsey, Beech Harbor, Maine, a lady who was much devoted to the reading of the Bible, attempted to execute the injunction "if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out," but was prevented from injuring herself. On the following Saturday she was heard repeatedly saying: "And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off." In the course of the day she rushed to the woodpile, and with one blow of the axe severed her hand from her arm. Leaving the hand beside the chopping block, she ran back to the house, screaming: "Save me, God, save me." Her mother-in-law, who lived with her, was so engaged at the time, that, before she was aware of it, the poor Bible reader had maimed herself.

In 1889, certain proceedings in equity, at Philadelphia, led to the discovery, that a very secular sect had been organized in that city several years before. Its leader, perhaps founder, was Anna Meister, a Swiss woman, her official name as head of the sect being J. Elimar Mira Mitta. In 1864, the society purchased a building in South Eleventh Street, and the deed was recorded in the name of "J. Elimar Mira Mitta," which, among the initiated, meant, "the daughter of Jehovah." Upon the death of Jehovah's daughter her followers, who had paid $5000 for her property, found that her heirs would

inherit, unless legal measures were taken. It appeared from the evidence given by her followers, that they looked upon her as the third person of the Trinity, a fact placed beyond all doubt, at least in their opinion, as an angel, which appeared at one of their meetings, bore a scroll, on which was written in golden letters, that Mira Mitta was the daughter of Jehovah and the sister of the Saviour. The evidence further showed that every Sunday religious service was held in the second story of the house, which part was fitted up as a place of worship. Mira, of course, as the third person of the Trinity, being surmounted with a brilliant crown, encircled with a bejewelled girdle, and arrayed in a loose silken robe, preached to her devoted followers, who abjectly bowed before her.

In 1889, Schweinfurth, already introduced to the reader in 1885, was heard from at different dates. April 28, a Mrs. Kinnehan, professing to be a Presbyterian, but who had recently become a Beekmanite, was placed on trial for blasphemy, apostasy, and heresy, before a Presbyterian court at Chicago. She had stated in public, that she believed Christ had appeared on earth in the person of Schweinfurth. She refused to have any counsel, saying she was able to defend herself. When asked to swear, she declined to do so, arguing from the Bible that it was proper to swear not at all. She insisted that she had been taught by the Presbyterian Church, that Christ was coming on earth, and she was now fully satisfied that Schweinfurth was Christ. The court decided that she should be expelled.

On the following day, a large delegation of Beekmanites from St. Charles, Minnesota, who had witnessed the dedication of a Temple in honor of Schweinfurth at Rockford, Illinois, returned home. They were highly elated with their visit, fully believing that they were the apostles of Christ (Schweinfurth), commissioned to

convert the Gentiles, as they called all other Christians. Impressed with this belief, they divided themselves into three delegations of three each, for the purpose of visiting the prayer-meetings held by their neighbors, and there preaching the new Christ. The neighbors, however, so rushed the proceedings, that Schweinfurth's apostles found it impossible to get in a word. And in one instance, the preacher, as soon as the exercises were concluded, made haste to get his horse and carriage and drove off with his wife, whom, at the end of the meeting, the Beekmanites were bombarding with arguments in favor of Schweinfurthism.

May 3, in the Associated Press reports it was stated, that Dr. J. S. Wilkins, of Chicago, was soon to begin suit for $25,000 against Schweinfurth, for alienating his wife's affections, she having recently embraced Schweinfurth's religion.

May 8, *The White Caps*, a secret organization formed for the purpose of employing Lynch law against parties who cannot be reached through the courts, notified Schweinfurth to leave Rockford and vicinity within ten days, under the penalty of being tarred and feathered, and roasted alive. They claimed that he was breaking up families. But he employed a night-watchman, bought guns and dogs, preparing to give the *White Caps* a hot reception.

About the last mentioned date, Schweinfurth's establishment, which is about five miles distant from Rockford, Illinois, was visited by a newspaper reporter, according to whom, Schweinfurth's property amounts to $500,000, derived from the offerings of his disciples. His house is magnificently furnished, and is large enough to accommodate a hundred persons. Such of his followers as live there, are engaged in the raising of blooded stock on his lands. His community consists of about fifty females, and twelve or fifteen men, who at-

tend to the rough work. The self-styled Christ was interviewed by the reporter, when the following dialogue occurred:

"Are you Christ?"

"I am. I am more than Christ, I am the perfect man, and also God. I possess the attributes of Jesus the Sinless, and have His spirit; and more than that, I am the Almighty Himself."

"This, then, is your second advent on earth?"

"It is, and I am accomplishing untold good. The time is not far off, when I shall make such manifestations of my divinity and power as will startle the world, and will bring believers to me by thousands and tens of thousands."

Further questioning brought out the additional facts, that Schweinfurth claimed to possess unlimited power, asserted that he could move from place to place in spite of all obstructions, raise the dead to life, cure diseases, and do all the miraculous things he performed when as Christ he was on earth before. He also stated that he would remain in his present body many years, and when that body would pass into the corruption of death, his spirit would enter into another body and still live on earth. He denied that free love was practised in his community. Some of the members were married, others single; but all who lived with him became pure like himself, who never experienced the passions of men. Asked if he had on his hands the marks made by the nails at his crucifixion when first on earth, he answered that he did not claim that his material physique had not changed and put on new flesh; on the contrary, new material substance had covered the point of the torturing instruments. Requested to give a sketch of his early life, he said that he was born of German parentage in Marion, Ohio, in 1853, and had studied for and entered the Methodist ministry, but soon became so dissatisfied

with the un-Christ-like course of his ministerial associates, that he could not feel of them, though among them. "In December, 1877, I met Dorinda Helen Fletcher Beekman, the bride of Christ. She was my spiritual Mary. She gave to the world its Jesus and its Lord." Yet this bold blasphemer, and his followers, not only read the Protestant Bible, but, of course, are prepared to justify their impiety by what they find therein. Every century since the fifteenth has had its Schweinfurth, all using the same text book as the Rockford reformer.[1]

The above list of follies, freaks, vagaries, and crimes resulting from the unrestricted use of the Bible, without note or comment to explain passages, which the simple and ignorant may interpret literally to their own detriment, or that of others, might be enlarged to almost any extent. The victims of delusions traceable to this source are so common, that nobody is surprised on reading in the public press that something silly, ridiculous, or even criminal has been done here or there, under an impulse derived from the intemperate use of the Bible. Some of these deluded creatures are placed where they can do no harm to themselves or any one else. Others among them, suspected of being more of the rogue than the fool, are driven out of the neighborhood which

[1] August 16, 1890, a mass meeting of indignant citizens was held at Rockford, in order to devise means to get rid of Schweinfurth. He was denounced as a fraud, a blasphemer, and an impostor. One of his apostles was present to defend him, and maintained that the doctrines and practices of the Beekmanites were all founded on the Bible, a book which he had brought along to prove that point. But the citizens thought they knew better, and passed a resolution calling on Schweinfurth to leave, without further notice. Subsequently, the State Attorney, in his charge to the Grand Jury for the October term of the Circuit Court, called on that body to investigate the charges against Schweinfurth, and the Sheriff, as directed, gave notice to the inmates of "heaven," as the home of the sect is called, to appear before the Grand Jury. The inmates, or at least some of them, did so appear on Oct. 9. The Grand Jury, however, declined to authorize further proceedings at the time. But the end is not yet.

they infest, or are shot down by infuriated mobs. It would be quite tedious to recount the manifold symptoms exhibited by the plague of Bible reading. For these symptoms vary indefinitely, according to times and places. But quite recently this plague has assumed a new phase, in the form of what is called by the initiated, the prayer cure, or faith cure, or Christian science,—a system of pathology, which dispenses altogether with the services of a regular physician, and in which the practitioner has recourse to prayer and the reading of the Bible, as an infallible cure for all manner of diseases to which human nature is subject. To these two or three specifics are sometimes added by those, who belong to this new school of medicine, what in their technology is designated, the laying on of hands and anointing: that is, the Biblical operator, who may be a lady or a gentleman, imposes hands and rubs with oil the person of the patient. But whether the manipulation and anointing refer to the entire body of the latter, or only the part affected, is not well understood, nor is it known whether any specific oil is necessarily used.

It is well known that this practice has already led to serious results, where, for example, the patient and friends, placing implicit confidence in its success, occasionally allow the disease to take its course without applying to any other means of cure than those mentioned, and death ensues; or when, as sometimes happens, those concerned in the case, on being practically convinced by the progress which the malady has reached, that it will not yield to their treatment, consent to employ a regular physician, the latter sees at once that he has been called too late to be of any service. In some cases, where children have become victims of this pernicious delusion, their parents have been called to account by the civil authorities as more or less responsible for the sad results that have followed. But it is hard to deal with such people;

and the most that any court can do with them is to appeal to what little reason they have left, and to assure them that a repetition of the offence may involve them in serious consequences. They will, if allowed to do so, quote text after text of Scripture, to prove that the prayer cure has the sanction of the Bible; but those who are charged with the maintenance of law, whether Protestants or Catholics, would not likely listen to the arguments of such lunatics.

There is, therefore, among our dissenting brethren, and there would be among ourselves, perhaps, were it not for the laws of the Church, a very large class of persons half educated, earnest, and honest, who devote much of their time to reading the good book, as they call the Bible, but being without a competent guide, mistake its meaning, and thus wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction; or finding that it has failed to act as a talisman against all evils incidental to human existence, fling [1] it from them as worse than worthless. Aside from the

[1] On May 31, 1889, Johnstown, in this State, was overwhelmed by a deluge, resulting from the bursting of a dam above the city. Out of a population of some 20,000, about 3000 lost their lives; various statements regarding the disaster and its consequences were published at the time. On June 6, a few days after the dreadful occurrence, one such statement appeared in the *New York Times*, a secular paper whose religious sympathies are Protestant. In that statement made by a representative of the paper in Johnstown at the time, it was asserted of the people there, that "Many of them have thrown away their Bibles, and, since the disaster, have openly burned them. They make no concealment of this. . . A lady who had lost her husband and four children was gathering together relics of her home, when she came across the family Bible containing the record of her birth, marriage, and the births of her children. A stranger happened to pass, and, tearing the records out, she proffered the book to him. The man happened to be a clergyman. 'Do you realize, madam, what you are doing?' 'Perfectly,' was the reply; 'I have no further use for that book. I have always tried to be a consistent Christian woman. I brought up my four girls as strictly as I was, but I cannot read that book any more.' The clergyman called on her the next day. She would not see him. At his request some of her friends visited her; she simply explained the circumstances, and refused to enter into any argument."

fact that the Bible, as most Protestants will admit, contains passages which cannot be read by many without moral contagion, it is evident that the holy and profoundly mysterious volume should never be placed in the hands of the class just referred to, without some useful note upon or explanation of all such texts as they might misinterpret to their own ruin. Indeed, some of the class are so mentally constituted, that it is not only unjust but quite unsafe to allow the naked Scriptures, even when honestly translated, to circulate among them. In fact, for all of them, selections from the Bible adapted to their capacity, or perhaps, better still, a history composed of the contents of the Bible and prepared by a competent scholar, would be much preferable to the Bible itself. There are now, and probably have been always in the Church, such books as the former, as well as the latter. Bible histories, particularly, when judiciously composed, are for ordinary readers far more instructive than the Bible as a whole, and, besides being free from the dangerously suggestive passages contained in it, can be safely recommended to persons of every age and condition. To this class of works belong several which were written in medieval times, and are still to be found in the libraries; such, for example, as Berchoire's *Repertorium*, Marchesini's *Mammotrectus*, and Peter Comestor's *Scholastic History*, which last maintained for many ages its well-merited popularity. It is true, these works were all written in Latin, and (it might be said) were practically of little use. But we are to remember that, at the time they were written, Latin was very generally understood by all educated persons, so that almost every one who had learned to read might derive instruction from their perusal. The Latin in which they were written was often used as a means of correspondence by others besides bishops and priests. Even ladies availed themselves of it for that purpose. We have still quite

a collection of letters written in Latin by St. Hildegarde to popes, bishops, priests, laymen and ladies, with others written by them to her in the same language.[1] Thus we find, that Christians in those early times were provided by the Church, as her members are at this day, not only with versions of the Bible, which each one able to read could understand, but with books which contained a connected account of everything recorded in the Bible, and were written in a language with which all who had received an education were more or less familiar. And these books were of such a character, that, unlike the Bible, they could be read without danger of moral contamination or mental insanity.

Yet the malicious fable invented by the early biographers of Luther, that the Bible was an unknown book when that apostate monk threw off his cowl and violated his vows, has been unblushingly repeated by his followers ever since, and no amount of testimony to the contrary can induce some of them to withdraw the calumny, much less apologize for it. In Great Britain and Ireland, everybody who cared to inquire, knew from the beginning that the circulation of the Bible among their flocks was not only sanctioned but actually encouraged by the Catholic clergy. Yet large numbers of Protestants there still persisted in believing and even publicly proclaiming the truth of the slanderous statement, which, after being fabricated by Luther's historians, was imported into England. As all other means had failed to convince the Protestant public, that in this as well as many other matters pertaining to Catholic belief and practice its confidence had been shamefully abused by its teachers, the English and Scotch hierarchy in 1826 put forth a *Declaration* of Catholic principles, accompanied by an *Address* from the British Catholics to their Protestant fellow-countrymen, which bore the signatures

[1] Vide *Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum*, Tom. xxiii.

of ten Catholic peers, nine Catholic baronets, and nearly a hundred Catholic gentlemen of great respectability. Both documents were deposited in the British Museum, that they might remain there as a standing testimony of Catholic belief, and a solemn protest against the foul means employed by the traducers of that belief. The following from the *Declaration* refers to the subject on which we are now engaged, and speaks for itself:

"As to translations of the Holy Scriptures into modern languages, the Catholic Church requires, that none should be put into the hands of the faithful, but such as are acknowledged by ecclesiastical authority to be accurate, and conformable to the sense of the original. There never was a general law of the Catholic Church prohibiting the reading of authorized translations of the Scriptures; but, considering that many, by their ignorance and evil dispositions, have perverted the meaning of the sacred text to their own destruction, the Catholic Church has thought it prudent to make a regulation that the faithful should be guided in this matter by the advice of their respective pastors."

"The Catholics in England of mature years, have permission to read authentic and approved translations of the Holy Scriptures, with explanatory notes, and are exhorted to read them in the spirit of piety, humility, and obedience."

"Pope Pius VII., in a Rescript dated April 18, 1820, and addressed to the vicars-apostolic in England, earnestly exhorts them to confirm the people committed to their spiritual care in faith and good works, and to that end to encourage them to read books of pious instruction, and particularly the Holy Scriptures, in translations approved by ecclesiastical authority; because, to those who are well disposed, nothing can be more useful, more consoling, or more animating, than the reading of the Sacred Scriptures; understood in their

true sense, they serve to confirm the faith, to support the hope, and to inflame the charity of the true Christian."

The archbishops and bishops of Ireland, in the same year, published a similar *Declaration* of Principles, in which, among other statements, they affirmed, that "The Catholics in Ireland of mature years are permitted to read authentic and approved translations of the Holy Scriptures, with explanatory notes, and are exhorted to use them in the spirit of piety, humility, and obedience."

There never has been a country, whether exclusively or partially Catholic, whose hierarchy with their flocks would hesitate to subscribe to the sentiments expressed in these extracts. These statements, when they were made, were widely published throughout Great Britain and Ireland. They, as already remarked, were even deposited permanently in a public institution, where they were accessible to all who cared to read them, as if their authors feared not to challenge contradiction; yet after that Protestant writers were to be found who maintained that the Church was opposed to the circulation of the Scriptures. And well it would be for the credit of the religion which these writers professed, if as a class they had already become extinct, wherever the English language is spoken. For surely there is nothing but disgrace to be gained in the end by the repetition of a statement, which enlightened Protestant critics have long since rejected as false. The few, who from time to time still try to fan into flames the smouldering embers of religious bigotry by a reproduction of this threadbare slander, can in most matters be just, generous, courteous, and truthful; but the moment they undertake to deal with the doctrine and discipline of the Church, all these humane characteristics disappear, so that Catholics are no way surprised on finding these

gentlemen making use of language in reference even to the First Bishop of Christendom, which they would be too polite to employ when writing about the Grand Lama.

It is quite possible that, notwithstanding all that has been done by Catholic writers who have preceded us to prove that American Catholics have been amply provided by the direction of their pastors with various editions of the *whole* Bible, a privilege denied to their followers by the reformers, there may still be found in this country a few of that once numerous class of persons who, inheriting the prejudices introduced from Great Britain and Ireland by their forefathers, still believe that the general reading of the Scriptures is forbidden by the Pope, the bishops and the priests carrying out his instructions in the matter. For the information, therefore, of all such we beg to direct attention to the following decree of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866, remarking, as we do so, that this decree was simply the re-enactment of one passed in a previous council held in the same city. "We direct therefore that the Douay version, which has been received in all the churches whose members speak the English language, be retained by all means. But the bishops will take care that all editions of that version, both of the Old and New Testament, shall hereafter be made after the most approved copy, to be designated by themselves, and, shall be provided with notes taken only from the Holy Fathers of the Church or learned Catholic writers."[1] Perhaps that decree was displeasing to the Pope. Like all decrees of similar councils, that one, before becoming law, had to be submitted to him. Did he condemn it? Quite the contrary. For, in replying to the President of the Council, he said that, "a revision of the Douay version seems opportune; and although the Holy See

[1] *Conc. Plen. Balt. II., Acta et Decreta*, pp. 14, 15.

is averse to sanctioning versions of the kind with its approbation, it considers you will perform a work in itself useful and conformable to the wishes of the Baltimore Council of 1858, if, after inviting the assistance of divines familiar with biblical science, and collecting together not only various editions of the Douay version, but even other English versions besides the Douay version, if such be extant, and employing other means specified in the decree, your Grace would undertake the correction of the aforesaid version." [1]

[1] *Conc. Plen. Balt. II.*, p. cxxxviii.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

NOT ONLY IN ENGLAND BUT IN ALL OTHER CHRISTIAN COUNTRIES WAS THE BIBLE TRANSLATED INTO THE VERNACULAR OF EACH LONG BEFORE THE INVENTION OF THE PRINTING PRESS, THE DEUTERO BOOKS BEING IN EACH CASE MIXED AMONG THE OTHERS.

So far we have endeavored to ascertain all that has been done by the Church, from first to last, to give the Bible to the people of England and others elsewhere speaking the same language. The result is before the reader. And, although the records of her action in ages preceding the Reformation is far from complete, on account of the wholesale destruction to which those records were consigned at the latter period, that result shows that during those ages the reading of the Scriptures in the Latin Vulgate, or in such authentic translations as existed at the time, instead of being forbidden in Great Britain, was actually encouraged there by the ecclesiastical authorities. We have also seen what has been done by the Church to secure the same privilege for the other nations of Western Christendom since the time when the printing press was substituted for the pen, in multiplying copies of the sacred volume. And we now propose to glance at the various efforts which were made under her auspices or after her example, before that time, to bring the Scriptures to the knowledge of those other nations by the same means,—versions in the vernacular of each. Let us begin with—

Germany.—About the middle of the fourth century

Ulphilas (Little Wolf), a bishop of the Mœso-Goths (now Wallachians), a German tribe, translated the Scriptures into their language, a dialect of the Gothic from which modern German is derived. Of this Gothic Old Testament nothing but a few fragments of II. Esdras or Nehemias have been preserved, though portions of the other books have been discovered. Of the New Testament belonging to this version a great deal has been printed in detached parts, several of them having been discovered by the indefatigable Cardinal Maii. Ulphilas translated his Old Testament from the Septuagint, and his New from Greek manuscripts. Another version in the German of his time was made by order of Charlemagne, and Louis the Debonair is said to have caused another German version to have been made soon after. And Otfrid about the same time wrote a rhythmical paraphrase of the Gospels in German, which is still extant. In fact, the appearance of new versions from time to time seems to have kept pace with the progress of the language. For we find among the earliest books printed a German translation of the Scriptures dated 1466, which had been made some time previously by an unknown writer. Two printed copies of this Bible, without any date, are preserved in the Senatorial library of Leipsic, one having in writing the date 1467. This Bible, besides these editions, was republished at least sixteen times, with improvements, before 1534, the year in which Luther's translation appeared.

France.—So far as known, the earliest attempt at translating the Scriptures into French resulted in the execution of a version of the books of Kings and *Machabees* referred by Le Long to the eleventh century. Several manuscript versions of the Psalms still survive, which are supposed to have been made in the twelfth century. "In the eleventh and twelfth centuries," says Hallam,[1]

[1] *Middle Ages*, part ii., p. 573.

"we find translations of the Psalms, Job, Kings, and *Machabees* in French." Jean de Vignes, at the request of Jane of Burgundy Queen of Philip, King of France, translated the Epistles and Gospels of the Missal. A catalogue of the library collected by Charles V., King of France, and dated 1373, contains a notice of a volume comprising the books of Proverbs, Psalms, *Wisdom*, Ecclesiastes, *Ecclesiasticus*, Isaias, and eighteen chapters of Jeremias. In the same century, and by order of the same monarch, Raoul de Presles translated the Bible into French as far as Psalms or Proverbs.

Italy.—The first version of the Scriptures into Italian appears to have been made in the latter part of the thirteenth century by James a Voragine, a Dominican monk, afterwards Archbishop of Genoa. But the Italians may be said to have possessed all along before that in the Latin Vulgate a Bible in their vernacular.

Spain.—In the reign of Alfonso the Wise (d. 1284) the Bible by his direction was translated into the Castilian dialect. Reference has already been made [1] to another Spanish version, printed in 1478, but written about 1405, and therefore several years before the printing press was introduced. It was the work of a Carthusian monk, Boniface Ferrer, if not of his sainted brother Vincent, who at least assisted in its preparation, and died in 1419. Indeed, according to the testimony of Carranza, Archbishop of Toledo (d. 1576), as quoted by Balmez, [2] it appears that the Scriptures were translated in Spain into the vulgar tongue "by order of the Catholic sovereigns, at the time when the Moors and Jews were allowed to live among the Christians according to their own law."

Portugal.—As early as the reign of John, surnamed the Great, who governed the country from 1385 to 1433, the New Testament was translated into Portuguese, according to the historian, Emanuel Sousa.

[1] Supra, p. 440. [2] *Protestantism and Catholicity Compared*, p. 215.

Flanders.—From a fragment of a manuscript Bible written at Worcester, in 1210, it is learned, as we are told by Usher, that the Bible had been translated into Flemish before that time.

Poland.—About the close of the fourteenth century the Bible was translated into the Polish language by order of St. Hedwige, wife of King Ladislaus IV.; and during the same reign there seems to have been a second version by And. Jassowitz.

Bohemia.—As John Huss in one of his controversial tracts alludes to a Bohemian New Testament, a version of at least that part of the Scriptures in the Bohemian language must have been made, at all events, about the beginning of the fifteenth century, if not earlier.

Sweden.—A Swedish version of the Bible was made in the fourteenth century by the direction of Sweden's sainted Queen Brigitte.

Iceland.—Jonas Arnagrimus, one of the disciples of the celebrated astronomer, Tycho Brahe, mentions an Icelandic version which must have been made as early as 1279, for it was extant at that time.

Hungary.—We learn from Danko,[1] that according to an ancient author of a life of Blessed Margaret, daughter of Bela IV. (d. 1270), she was accustomed to read the Psalms and Passion of Our Lord in her own vernacular. A manuscript copy of a version of the Scriptures in the Hungarian language, made by Thomas and Valentine, Friars Minor, in the fourteenth century, is still preserved at Vienna. It contains the books of Ruth, *Judith*, Esther, *Baruch*, part of Daniel, part of Malachias, and the other Minor Prophets complete, but is in a mutilated condition. The version has been made from the Latin Vulgate, and is provided with Jerome's prologues. There is reason to believe, that it at first comprised the other sacred books, for there is preserved at Munich another

[1] *De S. Script.*, vol. I., p. 244, etc.

manuscript, containing a Hungarian version of the four Gospels by the same authors. Fragments of a Hungarian version, which some suppose to have proceeded from the same source, are to be found in a manuscript belonging to the episcopal library of Alba Carolina, a town and bishop's see in Transylvania. These fragments consist of a mutilated translation of Job and the Psalms, together with portions of the Gospels and Epistles by a later hand. Friar Bartholy, a man of noble extraction and a member of the order of St. Paul the Hermit, sometime before 1456 (for he died in that year), translated the entire Bible into the Hungarian language. The people of Hungary, therefore, like the Catholics of other countries, had the Bible in their own language long before the invention of the printing press.

Sclavonia.—In the ninth century SS. Cyril and Methodius, brothers, whose feast by the direction of the present Sovereign Pontiff is celebrated on the fifth of July, translated the Sacred Scriptures into the language of the Slavonians (Bulgarians). The version was made from the Septuagint copy of the Old Testament and from Greek manuscripts of the New. It is to be observed, however, that according to some critics, Cyril and Methodius translated into Slavonian only certain portions of Scriptures. Yet, existing manuscripts show that a complete version was made in that language not later than the fourteenth century.[1] The two sainted missionaries, who were the first to present the Scriptures in a language which was the basis of the various dialects spoken by the Moravians, Bohemians, Poles, Mucovites, Russians, Bosnians, Servians, Croatians, and Bulgarians, converted to the faith several of the tribes in the neighborhood of those among whom they principally labored. They also invented the Slavonian alphabet, and translated the Liturgy into the Slavonian tongues, which,

[1] Danko *De S. Script.*, vol. I., p. 239.

besides the Latin, Greek, Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopian, and Armenian, is the only one in which the Church allows the divine offices to be performed. But these are all dead languages.

Ireland.—What was done in early times to provide the people of Ireland with the Scriptures in their vernacular we have no means of ascertaining. If Hallam, a writer not disposed to indulge in extravagant praise of Ireland, felt justified in saying that in the seventh century, "When France and Italy had sunk in deeper ignorance, the Irish monasteries stood certainly in a very respectable position," and that, "that island both drew students from the Continent, and sent forth men of comparative eminence into its schools and churches," [1] one can hardly suppose, that no translation of the Scriptures was made by those Irish scholars in their mother tongue. Still, we can find no trace of any such version before the fourteenth century, when it appears one was made by Richard Fitz Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh, who died in 1347. According to Hartwell Horne,[3] William Daniel, Protestant archbishop of Tuam, (d. 1628), translated the New Testament into Irish, and in 1629, with the aid of an Irish scholar named King, the Old Testament was translated by William Bedell, Protestant Bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh (d. 1641). King, who was ignorant probably of all languages except Irish and English, translated the English Protestant Old Testament into Irish, and Bedell, who may have had some knowledge of Irish, compared King's version, it is said, with the originals. The entire Protestant Bible having thus been translated into Irish, earnest efforts were made to secure a circulation for it among the na-

[1] *Literature of Europe*, Part I., ch. ii. § 7.

[2] Le Long, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, tom. II., p. 369, Boerner ed.; *Nouvelle Biographie*, vol. XLII., p. 178.

[3] *Introd. Biographical Appendix* to vol. II., p. 87.

tives. But they, to the disgust and surprise of its authors and patrons, were no more disposed to accept an Irish Protestant Bible than they were to countenance the Protestant clergy, which England thrust upon them.

Very probably, however, even before Fitz-Ralph's translation appeared, efforts in the same direction had been made by Irish scholars. This conclusion seems easily reached by a careful study of a manuscript preserved in the University (formerly the Cathedral) Library of Wurtzburg in Germany, where an Irish monastery long existed, and was frequently visited by Irish ecclesiastics in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Until quite recently it was hardly known that the manuscript in question existed. At last several quotations from it, which appeared in the learned work of the German scholar Zeuss on Celtic Grammar, directed general attention to it, and it was pronounced by Zeuss himself and other Celtic antiquarians, a production of the eighth or beginning of the ninth century. It contains a Latin version of the Epistles of St. Paul, as far as Hebrew vii. 5, accompanied with an Irish gloss of the sacred text between the Latin lines and in the margin. The hand-writing of three scribes is discernible in it. But it contains no date and no name, and has been appropriately designated *Codex Paulinus.* This interesting relic of ancient Irish scholarship was of course the work of some Irish scribes at Wurtzburg, or in their own native Isle, who had it conveyed to their monastery in Germany, or left it there with the hope that it might be preserved to posterity. An English translation of it was published in Great Britain in 1887. And in the following year several portions of this translation appeared in Dublin. As many of the glosses are simply Irish translations of the Pauline text, it would seem that the Irish people became familiar with the scriptures at a very early period by means of versions in their native tongue.

With the exception of this Irish Protestant Bible, mentioned above, all the versions just enumerated were made before the invention of the printing press with the approval of the Church or of her children who labored in her name, and were actuated by her spirit as well as encouraged by her example. But this enumeration would not be complete, were it not to include also those various other versions, which have been executed almost all of them by writers belonging to her communion for the use of the Christian communities throughout Asia and Africa, as the Syrians, Armenians, Arabians, Egyptians, Ethiopians, and Georgians, together with the versions made into several of the dialects spoken by some of these peoples. Besides these, there are probably many other versions, it may be of a later date, and of which very little is known, but all originating in the anxiety which the Church has always exhibited to give to the faithful the Scriptures in their own vernaculars, whenever there was reason to believe that that favor would not be abused. Thus John Pinkerton,[1] a Scotch antiquarian, who died in Paris in 1826, found in that city translations of the Bible into the dialects of Northern Asia and Thibet, each with the characters of the language in which it was made. These translations were preserved in the archives of the Propaganda, and constituted part of the plunder which Napoleon I. carried away from Rome to Paris.

It were unnecessary, even if possible, to give a list of all such versions. Mere reference to them is all that the present work calls for. Indeed, they are here alluded to only in a general way, as they serve, in connection with those made in Western Christendom, to show that the policy of the Holy See has been at all times that which prompted Pope Damasus to encourage St. Jerome in undertaking those labors, which have re-

[1] *Encyclopedia Americana*, vol. II., p. 93. (Boston 1856.)

dounded so much to the purification of the sacred text and the elucidation of its meaning. Circumstances did not always require the Roman Pontiffs to express in acts or in words their sentiments on the subject now before us. But when it became necessary for them to do so, no one can doubt that their language was universally such as to show, that they considered it an essential part of their office to guard the integrity of the Sacred Scriptures, and to encourage the study of them by the laity as well as by the clergy. Gelasius in the fifth century, Innocent III. in the thirteenth, Eugenius IV. in the fifteenth, Gregory XIII. in the sixteenth, Pius VI. and Pius VII. in the eighteenth, and Pius IX. in the nineteenth, not to mention others, did simply, each in his own way, and according to the nature of the case before him, what Damasus had done in the fourth.

It appears therefore from the facts already stated, and confirmed by the testimony of Protestant as well as Catholic writers,[1] that, before ever a printed book appeared, the Scriptures had been translated not less than twenty-nine times into the principal languages spoken in Europe. These languages, each entirely distinct from the other, amounted to about fourteen. Into some of them the Scriptures had been translated frequently, into others but once. As many as seven of the entire number were made for the people of England, and of these as well as of all the rest several contained the entire Bible. At least three translations,—two complete and one partial—had been made previous to the period just mentioned, for the use of those who spoke the German language. The number of translations which have been made since then into the languages of West-

[1] Several of these writers have been already mentioned in the preceding remarks. To these may be added Dr. Spalding in his *Hist. of the Prot. Reform.* I., ch. xi.; a writer in the *Dublin Review*, vol. I.; Dr. Wright, Kitto's *Cyclopedia*, (*Versions.*)

ern Christendom, of course far exceeds that of those produced in the previous period; of the former at least five are written in English, and probably a greater number in German. And those English and German versions which preceded the printing press, as well as all others written since, generally contained the entire Bible, and have, many of them, served as sources of innumerable copies or editions.

It is, therefore, no exaggeration to say, that before Martin Luther gave, as his admirers boast, the Bible to the people, the Catholic Church had already given them the genuine Scriptures in their own vernaculars, some fifty times, without counting the written copies made of manuscript versions, or editions issued of printed versions, all executed not only with her permission but under her encouragement. In the ordinary course of her ministrations, and in the absence of all rivalry and opposition, she had repeatedly sanctioned, and through her clergy, even undertaken and accomplished the production of version after version, for the people of England and Germany, ages before Luther, Tyndale, and Coverdale conspired to mutilate and pervert the sacred contents of the inspired volume by assuming the role of translators.

Nor should it be forgotten, that all those vernacular versions, which preceded the reformation in Europe, whatever their language, having been made either from the Vulgate or Septuagint, both containing the Tridentine canon, included the deutero Old Testament Books. So thoroughly convinced were the people everywhere, that these books were part of God's written word, that neither Luther nor King James I. dared to exclude them from their translations. Had they done so, these translations would have been summarily rejected by the people. The most they could do, and they did do it, was to remove these books from the places

they had occupied all along, insert them at the end of the Old Testament, and call them *Apocrypha*, a word of whose import the rank and file of Protestants at the time had no conception, and to which they attached no importance, just as they did not consider the relative position assigned any particular book or number of books a vital matter. They had in these vitiated versions all the books their fathers had before them, that was enough. Of the character of these versions they were unable to judge. The purport as well as the necessity of these changes, however, gradually grew upon many Protestants, especially in Great Britain, under the influence of the teaching they received, till at last the British and Foreign Bible Society, as we have seen, as if conscious of its own infallibility, by a definitive sentence, from which no appeal was allowed and against which no protest was heeded, declared, that the *Apocrypha* were no part of the Sacred Scripture, and not only forbade its publishers to issue, or its agents to distribute Bibles containing the condemned books, but even directed that its members should not assist, nor its funds be expended in the circulation of Bibles in which those books were inserted. Yet these are the people whose denunciations of the tyrannical and arbitrary policy, which they falsely attribute to the Church of Rome, are applauded by the silly enthusiasts who love to swell the crowd at Bible meetings and pan-Protestant conventions.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

Protestant Confessions of Faith on the Canon of Scripture.

Having, in the preceding pages said all that seemed necessary regarding the opinions expressed on the Canon of Scripture, and the versions written by the early reformers, and, having also stated what has been done by the Church to place the Scriptures in the hands of the laity, as well as explained the principles, by which her action in this matter is regulated, we are now at liberty to discuss the views advanced on the Canon in those declarations commonly called "Confessions of Faith," which have been publicly set forth by themselves, as standards of belief professed by the various Protestant denominations.

In the first *Articles of Religion*, amounting to forty-two, which the Anglican denomination in 1552 adopted and promulgated with the royal sanction, no catalogue of the Scriptures appeared.[1] Edward VI. and his spiritual advisers were probably willing that the people should continue to believe as they had always done, that God himself was the author of all the books commonly included in the Latin Vulgate, or in those translations of it which they and their forefathers had been accustomed to read ever since they became Christians. In fact, it was not until 1562[2] that a new light, under the benign influence of Queen Elizabeth, burst upon the minds of those who shaped the policy of the Established Church

[1] Kitto's *Cyclop.*, vol. I., p. 557. [2] Ibid.

and dictated the creed of its members. It is not said, nor was it claimed, that they, in this or any other matter, were guided by a special revelation, or by the possession of superior knowledge. But the substitution of thirty-nine articles for forty-two was the result. And in this instance the change was approved, if not made, by the lady who, as sovereign, exercised supreme power in spiritual as well as temporal affairs.

These thirty-nine articles are put forth as an expression of the religious belief entertained by all who profess Anglicanism, even though unable to agree about the meaning of some of them. It is in Article VI. that a list of those books is given which alone Anglicans receive as canonical. That list is followed by another, in which are included, besides III. and IV. Esdras, and the *Prayer of Manasses*, the deutero books of the Old Testament. "Holy Scripture," says the Article, "containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite to salvation." Very few of the points inculcated in the other articles would stand the test here established. Indeed, there is no truth that has not been proved an error, and no error that has not been shown to be a truth, on the authority of the Scriptures by some, who have appealed to its pages. "In the name of the Holy Scripture," continues the Article, "we do understand those canonical Books of the Old and New Testament of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church." Then follows a list "of the names and number of the Canonical Books," after which the Article adds, "and the other books (as *Hierome* saith), the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine; such as these following: *The Third Book*

of Esdras, the Fourth Book of Esdras, the Book of Tobias, the Book of Judith, the rest of the Book of Esther, the Book of Wisdom, Jesus the Son of Sirach, Baruch, the Prophet, the Song of the Three Children, the Story of Susanna, of Bel and the Dragon, the Prayer of Manasses, the First Book of Maccabees, the Second Book of Machabees." Probably because the canonicity of some of them had been denied by Luther and other reformers, there is no list given of the New Testament Books. The Article, in referring to them immediately after the preceding list, merely says, "All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them canonical." But there can be no doubt, that the godly framers of Article VI. intended to include, among the New Testament Books deutero as well as proto books,—books that had been doubted as well as those that had never been doubted. For the former, as well as the latter, have always been found in English Protestant Bibles, unaccompanied by any note implying that they were ever considered of inferior authority by any one.

The entire *Article*, from beginning to end, is untrue. For by several respectable writers *in the Church* the canonicity of more than one of those Old Testament books, which it pronounces canonical, has been doubted or denied.[1] Besides, there are several of "the other books," which, neither "Hierome" nor any one else (Queen Elizabeth's divines excepted) "saith, the Church doth read for example, etc.," or any other purpose whatever. In fact, St. Jerome is grossly misrepresented by these divines. For in his *Preface to the Books of Solomon*, to which Article VI. evidently alludes, the Saint is not only silent about Esdras III. and IV., but has not a word about "The Prayer of Manasses." In his *Preface to Daniel* he indeed mentions "the history of Susanna, the Hymn of the Three Children," and as he calls it, "the

[1] Vide Hody, *De Bibliorum Textibus*, pp. 646–648.

fables of Bel and the Dragon ; " but he does not even intimate what the Article makes him say, that "the Church doth read them for example of life and edification of manners," or reads them at all for that sole purpose; though she really reads and has always read them, just as she has always read the other canonical books. On the contrary, it would seem from St. Jerome's own words, that in his time the same use was made of those *fabulas* as of all other portions of Scripture, else why were they, as he remarks in the same Preface, "dispersed throughout the entire world." Such universal use of any Scriptural book, by the entire clergy as well as laity throughout the world (for this is implied in the statement of St. Jerome), might not be conclusive proof of its canonicity. It would, however, be strong presumptive evidence of the fact. And when, as in the case before us, that evidence is confirmed by the solemn verdict of an ecumenical council, the fact in question becomes one about which it would be extreme folly to entertain a doubt.

Dr. Wright, of Trinity College, Dublin, perceived the blunder committed by the authors of the Thirty-nine Articles in including Esdras III. and IV. among the other books referred to as uncanonical, and was candid enough to say, while alluding to Article VI.: "It is not, however, altogether correct in including in the number of books thus referred to by St. Jerome as read by the Church the third and fourth books of Esdras. These books were equally rejected by the Church of Rome and by Luther." [1] The critic might have added, "The Prayer of Manasses" as also rejected by the Church of Rome. The same learned writer has not failed to observe, that Article VI. is directly contradicted in two instances, by the Church of England in her homilies, and in a third instance in her preface to the book of

[1] Kitto's *Cyclop.*, Vol. I., 557.

"Common Prayer," the very volume in which the sixth as well as the rest of the thirty-nine Articles are proposed as a creed to be held by all conscientious Anglicans. "In the first book of Homilies," he goes on to say, "published in 1547, and the second in 1560, both confirmed by the thirty-fifth Article, of 1562, the deutero canonical books are cited as 'Scriptures,' and treated with the same reverence as the other books of the Bible; and in the preface to the Book of Common Prayer they are alluded to as being 'agreeable to, the Holy Scriptures.'[1] In an article on the Book of Judith Dr. Wright remarks that "Judith, with the other deutero canonical books, has been at all times read in the Church, and lessons are taken from it in the Church of England in course."[2] Elsewhere he says that "Bel and the Dragon is read. . . . in the Church of England on the 23d of November," and "Susanna is read in the Anglican Church on the 22d of November."[3] Discussing the authority of the Book of Tobias, he observes, that "its influence is still manifest in the Anglican liturgical forms, as in the offertory (Tobit. iv. 7, 8); also in the Litany, 'ne vindictam sumas de peccatis meis, neque reminiscaris delicta mea, vel parentum meorum.' In the preface to the marriage service there is also a manifest allusion to Tob. vi. 17, according to the Vulgate: Hi qui conjugium ita suscipiunt, ut Deum a se et a sua mente excludant, et suæ libidini ita vacant, sicut equus et mulus, quibus non est intellectus. "Chaps. i., ii., vii., and viii., are read in the course of lessons. It has been supposed from a comparison of Rev. xxi. 18 with Tobit. xiii. 21, 22, that the author of the Apocalypse must have been acquainted with the book of Tobit."[4]

We take the liberty of supplementing Dr. Wright's observations, by remarking that among the "Tables of

[1] Kitto's *Cyclop.* Ubaldi. *Introd.* Vol. II., 426. Smith *The O. T. in the Jewish Church.* p. 172. note 6, p. 163.

[2] Eusebius *Hist. Eccles.* Lib. iv. cap. 26.

Lessons of Holy Scripture to be read at morning and evening prayer throughout the year"[1] by all Episcopalian ministers, several lessons are taken from *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus*; ministers and members being thus encouraged to believe, that the canonicity of these books is no more to be questioned than that of the other books, from which selections are made for morning and evening prayers. If ever there was a time "when iniquity lied to itself,"[2] it was when the Articles of Religion and the Homilies of the Anglican Church were devised. For the books just mentioned, though used in the service of that communion indiscriminately with the other books of the Scripture, as we have just seen, and even designated "Scripture" and "Holy Scriptures" by the authors of the Anglican formulas, have been stigmatized "apocryphal" in the works of the most learned Anglican divines, and in the Anglican authorized version. And from that version they were, as we have seen, at last absolutely excluded by an arbitrary decree of the British and Foreign Bible Society. The victory then gained by Scotch Presbyterianism over effete Anglicanism seems to have been so crushing, that the authors of the latest revision of the authorized version had not the courage to venture a single allusion to the Old Testament deutero books. The consequence has been, that at this moment English speaking Protestants, generally, know as little about these books as if they had never been written, or as if they had not at all times, like those still retained in King James's Bible, been, as inspired documents, a source whence Christian writers derived many of the arguments by which they maintained the cause of revealed religion, as well as those moral

[1] *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, etc. According to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.* New York. 1845.

[2] Ps. xxvi. 12.

principles which served as stimulants to the faith and piety of those who professed that religion.

The *Helvetic Confession*, dated March 1, 1566, is in a great measure the work of Beza, the successor of Calvin; and of Bullinger, the successor of Zuinglius. It thus refers to the deutero books of the Old Testament: "We do not deny that certain books of the Old Testament were named by the ancients apocryphal, by others ecclesiastical, as being read in the churches, but not adduced for authority in matters of belief: as Augustine, in the 18th book of the *City of God*, ch. 38th, relates, that the names of the books of certain prophets were adduced in the Books of Kings, but adds that these were not on the Canon, and those we have were sufficient for piety." The authors of this confession, whether consciously or otherwise, seem to have misrepresented St. Augustine. It is not to the deutero books that he refers, but to books mentioned in "the history of the kings of Judah and Israel," as *the Book of Nathan the Prophet*, *the Book of Gad the Prophet*, and others, that have been lost. As it stands in the above extracts, the statement attributed to St. Augustine is none of his. It is not easy to see why his name has been introduced by Bullinger and Co., unless for the purpose of inducing their deluded followers by a fraudulent appeal to his authority to tear the deutero books out of their Old Testament. The way in which the authors of this *Confession* have apparently garbled the words of the Saint, and perverted their meaning, would persuade an ordinary reader that the illustrious Bishop of Hippo had condemned the deutero books as *apocryphal*, or designated them as merely *ecclesiastical:* whereas he did neither, but actually placed these very books in the same rank with all others belonging to the Old Testament.[1] By what foul means does error attain its end! What venerable names are invoked to justify the muti-

[1] *De Doctrina Christiana*, l. ii., cap. 8.

lation of the Canon! In London it is that of St. Jerome; in Geneva and Zurich, that of St. Augustine.

THE GALLIC CONFESSION—distinguishes between the proto and deutero books of the Old Testament, by declaring the former to be the rule and standard of faith, not only in consequence of the Church's consent, but on account of the testimony and intrinsic persuasion of the Spirit, by whom we are enabled to draw a distinction between them and others not of the same class, which, though useful, are not such as can establish any article of faith. Great importance was generally attached at the time to the internal suggestions of the Spirit, a method of argumentation which defied the assaults of reason, tradition, and even Scripture itself.

THE BELGIC CONFESSION,—like the preceding, permits the reading of the deutero books, but denies that any doctrine can be proved by them.

The *Waldensian Confession*—also makes a marked distinction between the proto and deutero books of the Old Testament. This Confession was once supposed to have been written as early as 1120. But it has been shown to have been the work of a Protestant, about 1520. Dr. Davidson admits that "It is not genuine,"[1] a polite way of saying it is a *forgery*. *Forgery* was one of those arts in which the reformers attained such remarkable proficiency, as to baffle until recently the efforts of the most expert detectives. In fact, Reuss confesses that the "confession" in which the Waldensians are made to say, that they drew a distinction between the proto and deutero books of the Old Testament is "forged."[2] Besides Davidson has proved, that "the Canon of the Waldensians must have coincided at first with that of the Roman Church."[3]

[1] *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Article *Canon*.

[2] *History of the Canon of the Holy Scriptures*, p. 264.

[3] *The Canon of the Bible*, p. 241.

The *Confession of the Dutch Churches*—dated 1566, after enumerating the books which alone Protestants generally consider canonical, and "respecting which no controversy existed," adds: "We make a distinction between them and such as are called apocryphal, which may indeed be read in the church, and proofs adduced from them, so far as they agree with the canonical books; but their authority and force are by no means such that any article of faith may be certainly declared from their testimony alone, still less that they can impugn or detract from the authority of the others." Then, assigning a reason why they consider the other books canonical, the authors of this *confession* say that "it is not so much because the Church receives them, as that the Holy Ghost testifies to our consciences that they have come from God; and chiefly on this account, because they of themselves bear testimony to their own authority and sanctity, so that the blind may see the fulfilment of all things predicted in them as it were with the senses." Those Dutchmen must have been much more sharp-sighted than most readers then or since.

The *Westminster Confession* was the result of a compromise between a number of pious, godly, and judicious divines, as they were called, composed of Presbyterians, Puritans, and Independents, whom the Lords and Commons of the British Parliament in 1643 selected to meet at Westminster "for the settling of the government and the liturgy of the Church of England." Episcopalians were also invited to take part in the deliberations, but they declined to do so, probably suspecting that, as the result proved, an assembly influenced by such strong Calvinistic tendencies as the members were known to possess generally, would deal a death blow, not only to what was then denounced as popery and idolatry, but to prelacy, superstition, the Anglican Liturgy, and the Book of Common Prayer. The dissensions that pre-

vailed at the convention were so grave and numerous, that its labors were not concluded until 1652. It was in 1646 that the godly divines completed what they called their "Confession of Faith." After enumerating the books commonly received as canonical by Protestants, but ascribing only thirteen epistles to St. Paul, these Westminster theologians proceed to say that "the books called Apocrypha, not being of Divine confirmation, are no part of the Canon of Scripture; and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God; nor to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than other human writings." Then, expounding the reasons, for which their canonical books were to be received as the Word of God, they declare that "the authority of Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not on the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God, the author thereof: and therefore it is to be received, because it is the Word of God. We may be moved and induced by the Church to a high and reverent esteem of the Holy Scriptures; and the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, etc., are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the Word of God; yet, notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and Divine authority thereof is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, being witness by and with the word in our hearts."

Here we have simply the Dutch manifesto intensified. The Westminster deliverance amounts to this: "the Scriptures are the Word of God, because they are the Word of God;" and if this argument will not produce conviction on the ungodly, tell all such reprobates that "the Holy Spirit declares to the inward man, the Bible is the pure Word of God, and no mistake." The men, who drew up the preceding exposition of belief regarding the Scriptures, must have had unbounded confidence

in the credulity of their followers; and the latter must have placed themselves outside the pale of reason, so far as the credentials of the Bible were concerned, when they believed what had been declared by their leaders at Westminster on the subject. In fact, by pursuing the same line of argument, the disciples of Mahomet could have no difficulty in proving, at least to themselves, that the Koran is a divine revelation. Nor, when our dissenting brethren are seriously told by their teachers, that the Bible is proved to be the Word of God by the application of such texts as those recommended by the Westminster divines, need we be surprised on learning, that the *Apostolical Canons* and *Constitutions*, with the various *liturgies* ascribed to St. Peter, St. Mark, etc., were considered by two such learned Protestant scholars as William Whiston and John Ernest Grabe to be of equal authority with anything the inspired Apostles ever wrote.[1] Yet the formula, in which the Westminster theologians declared their reasons for maintaining that some books are "divine" and others "human," is substantially identical with that put forward by the Dutch, French, Belgian, Bohemian, Scotch, and other Protestant Churches,[2] and appears to have been adopted word by word by Presbyterians of all shades and colors throughout the New as well as the Old World.

The period that witnessed the production of those startling manifestos, was specially characterized by theories regarding the nature, purpose, and use of the Scriptures, which no Protestant scholar would now undertake to defend. Prominent among those theories was one, according to which everything in the Bible, as it then stood, was to be received by those, with whom that volume was the sole rule of faith, as the work of God Himself. Thus the *Swiss Declaration* of 1675 in-

[1] Kitto's *Cyclop.*, vol., I., p. 177.

[2] Vide Reuss, *History of the Canon of the Holy Scriptures*, ch. xvi.

sists that "the Hebrew Volume of the Old Testament, which we have received from the tradition of the Jewish Church, to which formerly the oracles of God were committed, and retain at the present day, both in its consonants, and in its vowels,—the points themselves, or at least the force of the points,—and both in its substance and in its words is divinely inspired, so that, together with the volume of the New Testament, it is the single and uncorrupted Rule of our faith and life, by whose standard, as by a touch-stone, all Versions which exist, whether Eastern or Western, must be tried, and wherever they vary be made conformable to it."[1] Those who proposed and advocated this crude theory did not know, that every single autograph of every book belonging to the Old Testament had disappeared long before the Christian era. They were ignorant of the labor expended on the sacred text by the Masoretic doctors, and they of course took no account of the variations to be found in that text as well as in that of the New Testament, the books of which as originally written had also disappeared, not very long after the commencement of the Christian era; another fact of which the authors of the *Swiss Declaration* appear to have been ignorant. That *deliverance* of course has long since failed to find an advocate among Protestant scholars.

In fact there is hardly one of the Confessions of Faith enumerated above, that would find at this day among the sects, which first adopted them, a single educated individual disposed to defend all the doctrines enumerated therein. The Westminster Confession has probably met, all along, with more hearty adherence among the various branches of the Presbyterian denomination than any other. Yet, at this writing, arrangements are being made, which propose to eliminate from that creed its distinctively Calvinistic elements.

[1] Westcott, *The Bible in the Church*, p. 278.

Along with other changes, which advanced scholarship and sounder criticism have produced in these confessions, is that in reference to the canon of the Old Testament. Among the latest and most progressive thinkers on this subject may be reckoned Westcott and Davidson of England. Each represents a large and influential school of critics, one among the members of the establishment, and the other among the non-conformists. The former in summing up the testimony of the Eastern Church in regard to the canon, asserts that there the Book of "*Esther*, indeed was on the whole less supported than *Baruch*," [1] and while stating the general conclusion, to which patristic evidence leads, he repeats this statement thus: "Indeed, on the whole, if Christian evidence alone be taken, it appears that there is less evidence for the reception of this Book (*Esther*) as canonical in the fullest sense, than for the reception of *Baruch*." [2] Davidson goes so far as to recommend a readjustment of the Protestant canon, and while doing so declares that "Esther and Ecclesiastes cannot be put above Wisdom, 1st Maccabees, Judith, Baruch, or Ecclesiasticus. The doctrine of immortality, clearly expressed in the Book of Wisdom, is not in Ecclesiastes; neither is God once named in the Book of Esther as author of the marvellous deliverances, which the chosen people are said to have experienced. The history narrated in 1st Maccabees is more credible than that in Esther. It is therefore misleading to mark off all apocryphal (deutero) books as *human* and all canonical (proto) ones as *divine*." [3] Of the canon received by modern Jews and their Protestant scholars he asserts that "It was not.... universally received even by the Jews; for Esther was omitted out of it by those from whom Melito got his catalogue in Palestine; while Sirach

[1] *The Bible in the Church*, p. 243. [2] Ibid. p. 294.

[3] *The Canon of the Bible*, pp. 262, 263.

was annexed to it as late as the beginning of the fourth century. Baruch was also added in several Jewish circles, doubtless on account of its supposed authorship. Thus 'the pure Hebrew canon' was not one and the same among all Jews; and therefore the phrase is misleading.... A stereotyped canon of the Old Testament, either among Jews or Christians of the first four centuries, which excluded all the Apocryphal (deutero) books and included all the canonical (proto) ones cannot be shown." [1]

[1] *The Canon of the Bible,* pp. 265, 266.

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

Protestant critics on the Protestant plan for settling the Canon of Scripture.

An advocate of the Tridentine Canon may well be spared the necessity of proving, that the Westminster formula is dangerous because it fosters fanaticism, and absurd because it conflicts with the plainest dictates of reason, for all this has been done already, strange to say, by critics, who accepted the Protestant Canon. Thus Jeremiah Jones, a dissenting English minister, distinguished among his countrymen for his biblical knowledge, denounced, about the beginning of the last century, the irrational principle on which the creed makers proposed to determine what books of the Scripture were canonical, and what Apocryphal. The occasion to do so presented itself to him, while engaged on *A New and Full Method of settling the Canonical authority of the New Testament.* After admitting [1] that "though there are considerable difficulties relating to the Canon of the Old Testament..... these are solved with much more ease than those of the New," he thus continues.

"Can it be supposed, that out of a hundred books, or, as we may well suppose out of ten thousand, (for the argument will be just the same with the largest assignable number) that private Christians, or even our most learned reformers, should by an internal evidence agree precisely on the number of twenty-seven, which are now esteemed canonical, induced thereto by some characters

[1] Vol. I., pp. 2, 3.

those books contain, of their being written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost?"[1] This he conceives to be "folly and madness," and an assumption of "immediate inspiration."[2] "It first supposes the books are inspired, and then proves that they are so, because they are so. 'This is only an argument says' Bishop Burnet,[3] 'to him that feels it, if it be one at all."[4] "It is," says Mr. Jones, "not so easy a matter, as is commonly imagined rightly to settle the canon of the New Testament. For my own part, I declare, with many learned men, that in the whole compass of learning, I know no question involved with more intricacies and perplexing difficulties than this."[5] "If the question," adds Mr. Jones, "be why Barnabas's Epistle be rejected, and Jude's received—why the Gospel of Peter is excluded and the Epistle of Peter admitted into the Canon as the word of God, etc., alas! how little shall we have given in answer, unless what Baxter says, 'We believe as the Church does'[6]"

This Richard Baxter, another learned dissenting English minister, who wrote about the middle of the last century, also undertook to discuss the same question, and here are some of the conclusions at which he arrived. Speaking of those opposed to his plan of settling the canon by human testimony and tradition he says, "I would have the contrary-minded tell me how they know, without human testimony and tradition, that these are the same books which the prophets and apostles wrote, and wholly the same; that they are not depraved and wilfully corrupted; that these are all? How know you that one of the books of Esther is canonical and the other apocryphal? Where is the man that ever knew the canon from the apocryphal before it was told him, and without tradition? I confess, for my own part, I could never boast of any such testimony or light

[1] Ibid. p. 48. [2] Ibid. p. 49, seq. [3] Anglican (d. 1709).
[4] Ibid. p. 51. [5] Ibid. p. 2. [6] Ibid. p. 15.

of the Spirit, nor reason neither, which, without human testimony or tradition would have made me believe that the Book of Canticles is canonical and written by Solomon, and the Book of Wisdom apocryphal and written by Philo, as some think; or that Paul's Epistle to the Laodiceans—which you may see in Bruno, in Epist. Sixtus Senensis—and others, is apocryphal, and the second and third epistles of John, canonical. Nor could I have known all or any historical books, such as Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, etc., to be written by divine inspiration, but by tradition." Baxter's plan is more rational, less dangerous, but not more conclusive than that of his adversaries. Mere human tradition can never settle the canon of Scripture. But Baxter had a good deal more common sense than those who advocated internal illumination! as the following extract from his work shows. "Further, I would know, how doth an illiterate man know but by human testimony: whether it be indeed a Bible that the minister reads? or when he reads true, and when false? And whether any of these words be in the Bible which men say are in it? or that it is truly translated out of the Hebrew and Greek? or that it was originally written in those languages? or that copies were authentic out of which they were translated,"[1] Baxter might have asked himself or any of his learned Protestant contemporaries many of the same questions, and yet would have failed to give or to receive such answers as a rational and conscientious enquirer after truth would have exacted. One more extract from Baxter[2] will be appreciated by the reader, as a well deserved thrust at all, who substituted another canon for the one, which was followed everywhere east and west until the reformation. "It is strange to consider how we

[1] *Saints Everlasting Rest*, p. 141. New York. 1855.

[2] Ibid. p. 142.

all abhor that piece of popery as most injurious to God of all the rest, which resolves our faith into the authority of the church, and yet that we do, for the generality of professors content ourselves with the same kind of faith. Only with this difference; the papists believe Scripture to be the Word of God, because their church saith so; and we, because our church or our leaders say so."[1] Poor Baxter was unable or unwilling to recognize the difference between the papist and the protestant in this matter. The former believes the Scripture to be the Word of God on what is to him the divine authority of the Church. The latter believes the same thing on what he knows to be simply human testimony. That is, both try to reach a divine truth, the one by divine, the other by human means. And both admit that the point aimed at, lies in the supernatural order. The protestant, therefore, as well as the papist must perceive that that point, if grasped at all, must be grasped by means entirely different from those, by which scientific truth is attained; and consequently, that if he is ever to believe as he ought, that God is the author of the Scriptures, he must do that, not on the testimony of his Church or his teachers, but on the divine assurance of the Catholic Church, that such is the case. Hence St. Augustine referring to this subject declared: "I, for my part, would not believe the Gospel, unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me to it."[2] Take away the divine authority of the Catholic Church, and you make Christianity at most the best system of religion that was ever devised by *man*. When a papist says, I believe my church is infallible, and because she says so, I believe the Scripture to be the Word of God; his logic is unimpeachable. Grant the premiss and you must accept his conclusion; deny that premiss and Chris-

[1] Ibid. p. 161.

[2] *Contra Ep. Man. quam vocant Fundamenti*, c. v.

tianity for you ceases to be divine. But when a Protestant declares, as he must, I consider my church, my teachers, even my own reason all fallible; yet it is because one or other of these or all of them say so, that I believe the Scriptures to be the very Word of God; it requires no mental effort to perceive, that his creed is an unproved and unprovable religious theory, of which his teachers are the professors; and that the process by which he has reached his conclusion regarding the origin of the Bible, is not only illogical, but flagrantly absurd.

Robert Barclay, a celebrated Scotch Quaker, (d. 1690), declared that "It is impossible to prove the canon by the Scriptures, for it cannot be found in any book of the Scriptures, that these books and just these and no others are canonical, as all are forced to acknowledge."[1]

According to Richard Baxter,[2] Doctor John Whitaker, an Anglican minister (d. 1808), held "that it belongs to the Church: 1. To be a witness and keeper of the Scriptures; 2. To judge and discern between Scriptures which are true and genuine, and which are false, superstitious, and apocryphal; 3. To divulge them; 4. To expound them." Whitaker was one of several English Protestant controversialists, who wrote against the celebrated Father Stapleton. But he seems to have been one of those remarkable scholars, who actually stumble over the truth without apparently recognizing it. Such men have been met with in all Protestant countries, advancing step by step to the very threshold of the sanctuary, but without the courage, it may be the grace, to cross it. On the other hand great numbers of Protestants belonging to every rank and profession, faithful to the call of God and regardless of all human consider-

[1] *Apology*, prop. iii., § ix., p. 92. London Edition, 1780.

[2] *Saints Everlasting Rest.* 141.

ations, have sought and found in the Church relief from those perplexing doubts and that dreadful uncertainty, with which all honest inquirers are haunted in the sects. Of these converts not a few, after having labored faithfully in the Protestant ministry, have, when received into the Church remained ever after content and happy with the lot assigned them among the laity. Others of the same class, after being promoted to Holy Orders, have as members of the priesthood or of the hierarchy rendered invaluable service to religion by their great learning and untiring zeal; while of all of them it may be generally said that they have proved the sincerity of their conversion by their piety, their fervor, and their unflinching constancy to the true faith.

The humiliating admissions made by Jones, Baxter, Barclay and others, were no doubt wrung from them by the absurd, fanatical, and criminal proceedings of those, who, as directed by the reformed creeds and confessions, undertook to discriminate between canonical and apocryphal writings, relying either on their own reason, or the pretended guidance of the Spirit. For none of those creeds or confessions indicates any other way of ascertaining the canon. Even the most conservative of all Protestant sects—the Anglican—left each individual to decide the matter for himself. For though, in its VI. Article, it told him what were and were not canonical books, and in its XX. article, that it had "all authority in controversies of faith;" it did not assure him that no mistake could be committed in the exercise of that "authority," or that it itself could not err. Indeed, how could it give him such an assurance, after saying in its XIX Article: "As the Church of *Jerusalem*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch* have erred, so also the Church of *Rome* hath erred . . . in matters of faith," with such belief as this, of course the godly authors of the thirty-nine articles were too modest to claim infallibility for

the Church over which Queen Elizabeth presided; neither dared they assure the members of that Church that the time would never come, when it would be seen that "controversies of faith" among Anglican Christians should be settled not by convocation or council, but by a tribunal consisting of laymen appointed by the crown. Any one therefore belonging to the Established Church of England, if he had, as well might be the case, cause to suspect that the enumeration of canonical books contained in his Book of Common Prayer was defective could only allay his suspicions if at all, like any other Protestant, either by the exercise of his own reason or by the inward light of the *Spirit*.

Indeed the *Spirit* served as a sort of last ditch, to which the early Protestants fled, when driven from every other position taken in order to defend the authority of the Scriptures, or to prove what they believed to be its component parts. Thus Reuss [1] a Protestant writer, shows from Calvin's own words, that that stern reformer founded "the authority of the Scriptures on the inner witness of the Holy Spirit;" and held that the sentiment, that "the Scriptures were given us from the very mouth of God . . . . can be produced only by celestial revelations!" That the reading of the Scriptures was accompanied by such "revelations," Calvin is shown by the extract which Reuss has taken from his writings, to have had no doubt. This belief is still held by many Protestants. Indeed it should be held by all of them, if consistent. For it is either directly expressed, or is clearly implied in all those confessions of faith which have been formulated by their leaders and published for their guidance. But let us suppose that an earnest Protestant enquirer, whatever his sect, has with the light of the "Spirit," or of those "celestial revelations" mentioned by Calvin, solved to

[1] *History of the Canon of the Holy Scripture*, p. 302.

his own satisfaction all the difficulties connected with the origin and the canon of Scripture; how is he, let us ask, even if he be not illiterate, to ascertain the sense of all contained in the canonical books? In other words how is he to construct for himself a system of religion, out of what he finds in these books? In undertaking such a task, one as difficult as it is important, and one which no Protestant possessed of any self-respect and independence will shirk, what is there to guide or assist him in reaching a safe position? The answer must be: The Scripture itself stripped of all note or comment, a mere translation of the original Hebrew and Greek made into his own vernacular, by one, who for all we know may have been incompetent for such a work. This is actually what "the Presbyterian Church" tells its members. For in the "Confession of Faith," which that denomination has adopted for its people, they are informed that "The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself,"[1] and that "The supreme Judge, by which all controversies of religion are to be determined .... can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures."[2]

[1] *The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church*, p. 14. [2] Ibid.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

Luther on the Scripture—Hallam on Luther. Gaussen on the Canon.

A mere glance at the condition of the Protestant world now, or at any time since the Reformation, will convince any one that the principle "by which all controversies of religion," according to preceding extracts from the constitution of the Presbyterian Church, "are to be determined," [1] of course whether these controversies regard the canon of Scripture or any other question, is flagrantly insufficient. It is, besides, false and absolutely impracticable, a fact proved by the conduct of those who profess to be guided by it. For, let a member of any Protestant sect declare, that after making "a due use of the ordinary means" [2] prescribed [3] for attaining "a sufficient understanding of the Scriptures," [4] he is compelled in conscience to adopt a doctrine condemned by his sect, he is at once excommunicated. Yet this insufficient, false, and impracticable principle underlies the creed of every Protestant sect throughout the world; and was as soon as he abandoned his cloister boldly proclaimed by the father and founder of Protestantism, Martin Luther. This has been shown by Catholic writers who lived near his own time. We thus know that among his first errors, he taught that "the Scripture was the most certain, most easy, most evident, and most clear interpreter of itself:" [5] and that "the right to interpret

[1] *The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, p.* 14 [2] Ibid. p. 12. [3] Ibid.
[4] *The Larger Catechism*, q. 157. [5] Bellarmin *De verbo Dei* cap, 1.

the Scripture has been granted to the laity as well as the learned."[1] Yet the fatal fruits which this pernicious principle soon produced in Germany, gave Luther good reason to contradict his own teaching, as he afterwards actually did, but without either being ashamed of his own inconsistency, or confounded at the sight of the dreadful disorders in which his diabolical doctrines had involved his unhappy country.

In Luther's life, as written by Audin and other Catholic authors who had occasion to refer to it, will be found various specimens of that reformer's teaching which caused untold mischief wherever they were introduced. For the information, however, of the general reader, who may desire to know something about the distinctive features of Luther's system, it is better to overlook here what has been said on the subject by Catholic writers, and consult the work of an author, who, as a Protestant, cannot be suspected of exaggeration when exposing the dangerous principles inculcated by the man who is justly regarded as the founder of the religious system, on which all Protestant creeds are based.

Henry Hallam, L.L.D., an English Protestant born in the latter part of the last century, educated at Oxford, and considered "one of the most distinguished of modern authors,"[2] had been fiercely assailed by the admirers of Luther for certain remarks he had made about that reformer in his *Literature of Europe*. He therefore, in the subsequent editions of that work, felt himself called upon to defend the views he had already expressed regarding Luther. This he does by bringing forward certain extracts from Luther's own writings. Referring to Luther's treatise, *De Captivitate Babylonis*, he presents the following quotations from it: "Thus

[1] *Nat. Alexander, Hist. Eccl.* Tom. viii. p. 103.

[2] *Allibone's Dictionary of Authors.*

you see how rich a man is who is a Christian and baptized, who even should he so wish cannot lose his salvation, however great his sins may be, unless he refuses to believe. For no sins can damn him, unless unbelief alone. All other sins, if faith in the divine promise made to one baptized returns or remains, are cancelled in a moment by the same faith, yea by the verity of God; because he cannot deny Himself, if you have confessed Him and adhered faithfully to Him promising." More of the same horrible doctrine: "If adultery could be committed in faith, it would not be a sin."—Disput. 1520. And more still: "It is sufficient (Luther says) that by the riches of the glory of God we acknowledge the Lamb who taketh away the sins of the world; from Him sin shall not separate us, even if we commit fornication and murder a thousand, thousand times in one day. Do you think that the price paid and the redemption made for our sins is so great, and such a lamb is so little? Pray boldly, for you are the boldest sinner." What wonder that Mr. Hallam should confess that "all his (Luther's) notions about sin and merit were so preposterously contradictory to natural morality and religion, that they could not have been permanently received without violating the moral constitution of the human mind."[2] This conclusion is further confirmed by Mr. Hallam who cites for the purpose a horrible extract from the Heidelberg Propositions, 1518. So much for the moral principles propagated by Luther and based by him on the Bible. Of the language in which he addressed his hearers and readers Mr. Hallam says: "No serious author of the least reputation will be found who defiled his pages I do not say with such indelicacy, but with such disgusting filthiness."[3] "In all his attacks on popes and cardinals, Luther disgraces himself by a nasty and stupid brutality."[4]

[1] *Literature of Europe*, part I., ch. iv., p. 305, note.

[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid. 306. [4] Ibid.

The effect of Luther's "notions" and "filthiness" on his followers, one may imagine, but can hardly describe. "Munzer and Knipperdolling (says Hallam [1]) with the whole rabble of Anabaptist fanatics were the legitimate brood of Luther's doctrine. And even if we set them aside, it is certain that we find no testimonials to any reform of manners in the countries that embraced it." No, certainly; but on the other hand abundant evidence by Luther himself, his associates, and his contemporaries, that wherever his principles were adopted, anarchy took the place of social order, and christian morality was superseded by a code of ethics, which would have disgraced pagan Rome, and which tolerated, if it did not countenance, crimes, for which the Lord rained down from heaven fire and brimstone on the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha. Hallam would never have expressed himself, as he has done, about Luther's foul language and fouler moral principles, and the effect produced by these principles, wherever they were embraced; had he not been driven to it by Luther's imprudent apologists, who thoughtlessly undertook to defend their hero against a criticism, whose extreme moderation had been its only fault. Yet, swayed probably by the prejudices of his own country, perhaps by his sympathy with the part played by Luther in the religious rebellion of the sixteenth century, Hallam has treated very gently, if at all, Luther's views on marriage and divorce—views so disgusting and abominable, that they will not bear to be translated into English out of the Latin, in which they are still preserved, to the eternal disgrace of Luther and the lasting shame of the Reformation. In all Christendom the City of Salt Lake is probably the only place now, where their advocacy would fail to excite a feeling of public execration. The reader, should he desire further information on this unpleasant subject is referred

[1] Ibid.

to Audin's *Life of Luther* or other similar works, which contain that saddest of chapters in the annals of human depravity.

It was evident to all, except the misguided multitudes of fanatics, who indulged in the orgies fostered by the anti-christian principles of the Protestant reformers, that the dissolution of society as organized on a Christian basis was inevitable, unless some remedy could be found for the evils by which it was afflicted. But what was to be done? Either the right of private judgment was to be abandoned, or the secular arm invoked to suppress the disorders resulting from its exercise. The first was not to be thought of, as it implied the admission that the Protestant reformation was what no honest man could deny, an outrage on reason as well as revelation, and that the Catholic principle, which it antagonized, was the only one consistent with the peace and preservation of society. The second alternative was therefore preferred, and there was no one more urgent for its adoption than Luther himself. It was thus that in England as well as in Germany those ghostly fire brands, who were ever ready to sing psalms, expound the Scriptures, or fight the battles of the Lord, as circumstances demanded, were subdued after protracted and sanguinary struggles; and society extricated from the anarchical condition, to which an open bible and private interpretation had reduced it.

The friends of the reformation had good reason to be ashamed of the necessity, which compelled the civil authority to adopt such heroic treatment in checking those public disorders, which were the legitimate fruits of the principles on which that Reformation was based, and without which, as a system of religion, it must cease to exist. It was to be expected that some of these friends would exercise their ingenuity, in devising such modifications of the system, as would enable its followers

to profess it without being regarded with suspicion, or outlawed as many of them had been for their crimes. To deny to every one the right of interpreting the Scriptures according to his own private judgment, was to undo all that had been done—to renounce in fact the glorious reformation and return to Rome. This would never do. But was it not possible to retain that right, as the corner-stone of the Protestant system (for such it really is,) so that the professors of the system might for mutual help and encouragement group themselves into various organizations, according as they could agree in adopting a creed to be exchanged for another when it failed to satisfy; and yet place some restriction on the privilege each claimed of discriminating between canonical and apocryphal writings? This might mitigate, though it could not eradicate the evil.

Some such notion seems to have been entertained by Chemnitius, who, with Bucer, labored in vain to unite the Lutherans and Sacramentarians. The reformers regarded the former as one of their ablest advocates: and Melancthon, under whom he studied at Wittemberg, called him "the Prince of Protestant Theologians." He is the author of several works, notably of one entitled *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, in which he endeavors to refute the doctrines promulgated by the Council of Trent. He admits as canonical, only those books that have been approved by all the Churches, not such as have been declared to be so by Councils.[1] Gaussen, (d. 1863.) a native of Geneva and a Calvinistic minister developed the theory of Chemnitius, arguing that the principle, on which Protestants undertake to settle the canon is false and untenable, and substituting for it the testimony of the Jewish Church with regard to the Old Testament, and that of the Catholic Church with regard to the New. By the testimony of the Jewish Church,

[1] Ligouri, *Hist. of Her.* I. 325.

he understands "the common opinion of all the Jews, Egyptian and Syrian, Asiatic and European, Sadducean and Pharisees, ancient and modern, good and bad." And by the testimony of the Catholic Church "the universal agreement of the ancient and modern Churches, Asiatic and European, good and bad, which call on the name of Jesus Christ; that is to say, not only the faithful sects of the blessed Reformation, but the Greek, the Armenian sects, the Syrian sect, the Roman sect, and perhaps the Unitarian sects;" [1] the Mormons are omitted. And farther on, [2] he goes so far as to ascribe infallibility to both Jewish and Christian Churches, with respect to the Canon of Scripture. "The Jews, he says, *could not* introduce a human book into the Old Testament; and neither the Council of Trent, nor the most corrupt and idolatrous churches could add a single Apocryphal book to the New.... It was *not in their power* not to transmit them intact and complete. In spite of themselves it was so ordered."

Gaussen's work when it appeared in England was, his translator says, pronounced "invaluable." Yet here we have assumptions equally gratuitous with those, which Gaussen rejects as untenable. For neither the Scripture nor common sense furnishes a reason for believing that while God leaves the sects to follow their own conceits in matters of greater importance, He actually so controls or guides the belief of each regarding the canon, that when the canon of each is compared with the various canons of all other sects, one is thus enabled to make up a list of all those books which He recognizes as his own. Besides it is only the learned—if even they—who could derive any benefit from such a rule, as they alone could possibly know which are the books that each sect receives as canonical. To test the accuracy of Gaussen's rule, apply it to the age of Melito. At

[1] *Theopneustia*, pp. 131, 133. (Scott's transl.). [2] p. 134.

that time the Palestinian Jews had not Esther, but the Hellenists had, both however agreed in receiving all the other books on the Hebrew canon. The canon, therefore, at that period, according to Gaussen was the present Jewish canon minus the Book of Esther. If that was then the true canon of the Old Testament, it ought to be so still. How comes it, therefore, that at present the Jewish canon includes Esther? Moreover, the Arians for a long time were a very numerous and respectable sect, in fact as much so as any Protestant sect ever was. Nor are they yet wholly extinct. Well, among the doctrines which they denied was the canonicity of the Epistle to the Hebrews.[1] What therefore, let us ask, was the canon of the New Testament during the long period, in which Arianism contended for supremacy with the Church? According to Gaussen's rule it was the present canon, whatever it may be, with the Epistle to the Hebrews left out. What again was the canon of Scripture during the existence of other Christian sects? It was the canon, whatever may have been its actual and legitimate contents, less those parts thereof which the sects in question chose to reject. Thus the canon is made to depend not on the will of God, or the authority of the Church, but on the caprice of every rogue or fool who succeeds in gathering around him a sufficient number of knaves or dupes to constitute what he is pleased to call a church, the first work of that church or its founder being to mutilate or adulterate the word of God. Gaussen in a subsequent work,[2] remarks[3] that the Peshito catalogue wanted several books, (that is true for it had not the second Epistle of Peter, the second and third of John, that of Jude and the Apocalypse,) and that Origen's catalogue included most if not all of these books. Now at that time the former catalogue

[1] *Theodoret, Præf. in Ep. ad Hebræos.*

[2] *The Canon of the Holy Scripture.* [3] pp. 23–25 seq.

represented the belief of the Syrian Church, the latter expressed the faith of the Greek Church. But what was the canon of the New Testament at that time? Evidently according to Gaussen what it is to-day with five books left out. Gaussen's theory is therefore as objectionable as any of the other Protestant devices it was intended to supersede.

CHAPTER XL.

The Protestant Canon abridged by Emanuel Swedenborg, but enlarged by Joseph Smith.

Notwithstanding the caveats and protests of many learned and earnest Protestant scholars against the private inspiration claimed in the Protestant confessions of faith for all who read the Bible; the principle was generally acted on, and the ignorant as well as the learned undertook to decide, not only what was Scripture, but what was its sense. In the Old World for example, the last century was signalized by the reveries of the otherwise highly cultivated mind of Emanuel Swedenborg, who surprised his contemporaries by the extravagant theories he built upon and about the Bible. Yet he succeeded in founding what is called "the New Jerusalem Church," which numbers at present in Great Britain and the United States some nine or ten thousand souls known as Swedenborgians, their religious system being styled "Swedenborgianism." The membership of this almost latest form of Protestantism seems however gradually advancing towards extinction. Swedenborg himself rejected several dogmas generally admitted by his fellow Protestants, and as a consequence excluded from his canon of Scripture those books, in which such dogmas were inculcated. The original reformers had proceeded on the same principle, and their descendants could not justly complain, when the latest reformer commenced by regulating, not his belief by the Bible, but the Bible by his belief. He denied original sin, the

vicarious satisfaction of Christ, the resurrection of the flesh, and some other doctrines. The Epistles of St. Paul, the Acts of the Apostles, etc., formed, therefore, no part of the sacred catalogue of books which received his approval. According to one of themselves, Swedenborg's followers "do not believe that all the tracts bound up in their Bible can claim the grand designation (of the Word of God), but think, we (they) have a criterion for determining the products of the 'divine afflatus' from all the works of man." He does not say what that "criterion" is, but whatever it be, there is no doubt it has caused the Swedenborgians, like many other sectarists, ancient and modern, to make sad havoc of God's holy word. The same writer remarks in a note, that "The books of the word are the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, the Psalms, and all the Prophets in the Old Testament; and the four Evangelists and Revelations in the New. The other books (except the Canticles and Apocrypha) contain the truth —are written with as high a degree of inspiration as writers generally ascribe to those enumerated, but do not contain the intimate sense in a connected or divine series."[1] According to his own statement Swedenborg was permitted to see "the Heavens and the Hells" as he designates the abode of the blessed and the prison of the reprobate. He was in constant communication with angels, and received revelations immediately from God Himself, who, as he seems to teach, is one not only in essence but in person. And according to Rev. W. Mason a Swedenborgian minister: Swedenborg "By means of the divine science of correspondences between things spiritual and natural . . . . agreeably to which the Scriptures had been written . . . . could penetrate the clouds of the literal sense, and behold the spiritual sense which lies concealed therein."[2] Throw-

[1] *History of all Denominations*, p. 531. [2] Ibid. 535.

ing aside as so much rubbish the pretentious mysticism, rather the cabalistic language, that accompanies the description which Swedenborg and his followers have given of the key, by which they ascertain the sense of what they retain as the word of God, a close observer will find that that key differs not essentially from the one, which Protestants who have never studied "the divine science of correspondences" commonly use for the same purpose.[1]

In less than a century after Swedenborg had attempted in vain to propagate his speculations in the Old World; Joe Smith an illiterate peasant of Vermont startled the people of the New by announcing, that he had received from "an angel of the Lord" a revelation contained in a volume called "the Book of Mormon." "We (says Smith) believe the Bible, (the Protestant one of course,) to be the Word of God, so far as it is correctly translated; we also believe the Book of Mormon to be the Word of God."[2] It has long been regarded as certain that the "Book of Mormon" was originally no more than a romance written in the early part of the present century by Solomon Spalding, then a resident of Ohio, but formerly of Connecticut where he had been a preacher. At that time the fate of the ten lost tribes of Israel was a subject of curious speculation among bible readers in the United States, and Spalding as a matter of pastime or profit undertook to show that the American Indians were the descendants of the ten tribes, who, after various vicissitudes by land and sea, at last reached and settled in America. The result was a volume, which Spalding designated "Manuscript Found" but did not live to publish, having died in 1806. It fell

[1] For more about Swedenborg's system see Moehler's *Symbolism*, p. 525. and Alzog's *Universal Church Hist.*, vol. iii., 614, (Pabisch & Byrne) where it is said, Swedenborg "attacked the doctrine of justification as held by Protestants."

[2] *Hist. of all Denominations*, p. 410.

however into the hands of Sidney Rigdon, a citizen of Alleghany Co. Pa., who was connected with a Pittsburg printing office, where Spalding had left it. Rigdon having copied the manuscript it was returned to Spalding's widow. Rigdon subsequently abandoned the printing business, and became a preacher of principles similar to those incorporated in the "Book of Mormon." He even succeeded in gathering around him a small body of believers, who under his guidance combined their means, and purchased property in one of the South-western counties of Pennsylvania, where they all settled with him as their spiritual head, in hourly expectation of the coming of the Lord, an event of which he gave them the fullest assurance, careful however not to restrict its occurrence to any particular date. At last they insisted that he should give them day and date. And unable to resist their unanimous demand any longer he did so, declaring that on a certain night the Redeemer should come down through the hay mow in the barn, which the brethren had erected. There they spent the entire night in anxious and sleepless expectation, but the Lord having failed to put in an appearance, the community indignant and disappointed, immediately disbanded. Meantime Joe Smith had been in communication with the angel Moroni, of course according to his own account, and had thus been enabled to exhume near his home at Manchester, Ontario Co., N. Y., a record on golden plates, which with the aid of two transparent stones found at the same time and place and called by him the Urim and Thummim, he succeeded in deciphering to the great surprise of his simple neighbors. He had become associated with Rigdon and having thus obtained the latter's copy of Spalding's manuscript, he proposed with Rigdon's assistance, to make the contents of that volume and his own story about the golden plates and the Urim and

Thummim subsidiary to the creation of a new church. The "Book of Mormon" professing to be a transcription in English of the record on the golden plates, was printed in 1830. Soon after it was compared with Spalding's manuscript, and examined by several of Spalding's friends who had seen his romance. The investigation appears to have demonstrated that though somewhat different from Spalding's work, the "Book of Mormon" had been composed by one thoroughly conversant with that work, filled as it was with the same historical matter and containing many passages wholly or partially copied from it, though as far as possible it is written in the quaint style of King James's bible. All this seems to have convinced the public, that Joe Smith's bible is simply Solomon Spalding's romance dressed up in the phraseology of the authorized version. Joe's statements were believed by many as ignorant as himself, but not so shrewd; and he succeeded in a short time in gathering around him a large number of disciples made up of knaves, charlatans, fanatics, and fools. Driven from one part of the country to another in their efforts to establish a permanent settlement, after losing their inspired leader who on June 27, 1844, was shot dead at Carthage, Illinois, by a mob of excited and indignant citizens, Joe's followers at last migrated to Utah, a great part of which they at present occupy. There on the river Jordan, which connects Great Salt Lake and Lake Utah, they erected a temple and built a town, Salt Lake City, which serves as a centre of spiritual authority for "the Latter day Saints" as they call themselves. On Joe's death Sidney Rigdon hoped to become his successor, but was set aside in favor of Brigham Young, and being adjudged contumacious, was excommunicated. Cursed and solemnly delivered over to the devil "to be buffeted in the flesh for a thousand years" he disappeared entirely from history.

At first the Mormon prophet obtained followers principally from the eastern districts of the United States, but the supply from that quarter failing, his Apostles, Bishops, and Elders, as the highest Mormon dignitaries are called, were dispatched to Europe to secure converts, and have been extremely successful wherever Protestantism was the prevailing creed. Professor John Fraser of the Chicago University, in an article contributed to the Encyclopedia Brittanica states that Mormon converts come "particularly from Great Britain, Sweden and Norway.[1] Strangely enough, and the fact deserves emphasis, Ireland has furnished few if any recruits to the cause of Mormonism." Yes it did, one, who, in order to get a free passage joined a band of Mormons about to sail for America, but on landing was seen no more among the saints. However the Mormon missionaries were not much more successful among the Italians, French, Spanish, and other Catholic populations than they were among the Irish. The truth is, had there been no Protestantism there would most probably have been no Mormonism. Latterly several of our Southern States, where Catholic principles are almost unknown, have become very encouraging recruiting grounds for the Church of Latter day Saints. But a rigorous application of Lynch law in several instances to the missionaries, has convinced them that Southerners are not yet prepared to accept the code of morals introduced by the Mormon prophet, and that a considerable degree of caution is required on the part of those who undertake to preach the Gospel there, as it is un-

[1] "Three hundred and fifty Mormon emigrants, most of them Scandinavians, arrived at Castle Garden yesterday on the Wyoming. They were quietly hurried through the usual inspection and then departed westward for Salt Lake City. A number of Elders had them in charge. The party was made up of men, women and children, there being a large proportion of *young girls*." N. Y. Times, June 21, 1889. Such items appear in the N. Y. shipping news probably three or four times every year.

derstood in Salt Lake City. Among other peculiar customs the Mormons, soon after they were organized as a religious community, began to practice polygamy, though by the laws of the United States made for Utah it is now treated as a penal offence. At present therefore the Mormons no longer, as formerly, boast of possessing such a privilege, and if they still exercise it must do so in secret. Joe himself was the first to assume the care of more than one wife, and of course evaded any such responsibility, until he could, according to his own account, no longer resist the will of heaven made known to him by a special revelation on the subject. The example thus set by their prophet was soon generally followed by the rank and file of "the Latter day Saints" all believing that they found good authority for doing so, not only in the divine communication made to their prophet, but in the precedent established by the patriarchs of the Old Testament. To do justice to Protestants of other denominations it ought to be observed, that as soon as they understood thoroughly the tendencies of Mormonism, they had recourse to all possible means in order to check its progress. But it must be admitted those means too often savored of mob law and violence, and at last only partially succeeded, if even so; when those, who were opposed to the Mormons, had obtained the assistance of the military authorities. The sects commonly called Protestant refuse to recognize the Mormons as Protestants. But it is not easy to see why they do so. For like themselves, according to Joe Smith's confession of faith, the Mormons "believe in God the eternal Father, and in His Son Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost, that men will be punished for their own sins, not for Adam's transgression, that through Jesus Christ all men may be saved by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel—these ordinances being faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, Bap-

tism by immersion for the remission of sins, laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost;"[1] and, it may be added "The Lord's Supper," as inculcated by Smith himself.[2] They also "believe the ten commandments to be the rule of life, and the Bible to be the Word of God, as far as it is translated correctly; and believe besides in being honest, true, chaste, benevolent, virtuous, and in doing good to all men."[3] But, and apart from Mormon exclusiveness and Mormon violence, the result perhaps of aggression on the part of "Gentiles," as the Mormons call all other people; here is the main objection of other Protestant sects against the disciples of Joseph Smith: What about Mormon polygamy and what about the Mormon bible? Well the Mormons might say: Where is the great difference between polygamy as practised by the Mormons, and polygamy as practised by the Gentiles. A Mormon may have or may not have at the same time more wives than one or none at all; but once he takes a plurality of them he is bound to support every one of them as long as she lives, as he is bound to support her who is his only wife, whereas a Gentile by the easy and handy method of divorce among his people may be the husband of as many wives as a Mormon, provided he cohabit only with the last one selected; infidelity to whom is rarely punished, while he is not bound to provide for the other half dozen whom he may have dismissed. Among us Mormons every child knows its own father, with you Gentiles that is not always possible. Where then, let it be asked again is the difference between Mormon and Gentile polygamy? Let unprejudiced reason decide between the two systems. And as to the Book of Mormon, had not Joseph Smith as good a right to add a new volume

[1] *Hist. of all Denominations*, p. 410.

[2] See *A Word of Wisdom* by him.

[3] *Hist. of all Denominations*, p. 410.

to the Word of God, as Martin Luther had to tear several old ones out of it. In this case Joe poor creature, if you will have it so, in his ignorance sinned against the Holy Book by addition; but Mart., with his eyes open sinned against it by subtraction. Once more an unprejudiced reader might inquire in what did they differ?

Our object in the remarks just made has not been to show that the Bible is treated with anything like contempt, even by the most irreligious class of Americans, for such is not the case. On the contrary we believe that few pronounced infidels would have the boldness to stand up before an audience composed of the rank and file of our countrymen, or even exclusively of those among them who never enter into a meeting-house, and directly call in question the divine inspiration or even the truth of the sacred volume. The fault of Americans is to treat it with careless familiarity, or to have it so treated, and approached without that profound reverence due to every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. They do not realize that it is to be handled as something essentially sacred, and to be read with fear and trembling. And hence one meets it not only in the church, the pulpit—its proper position,—and in the choicest place of the family library, but on desks of thoughtless school children, in rail-road cars, steam-boats, and the rooms of hotel guests, soiled and torn, with its margins and blank leaves covered with senseless and irreverent scribblings. Thus it is too often treated as something very common, receiving less attention and hardly more respect than is paid to the paper, from which readers learn the news, and the price of stocks. And if a Catholic, indignant at all this, and zealous for the honor of God and God's holy word dares to remonstrate against such profanations, he finds himself at once pilloried as an enemy of the Bible.

But enough on this point. Before the reader's attention was directed to the criminal vagaries of Joe Smith and his followers, as illustrating the danger to be apprehended from the unrestricted circulation of the Bible among half educated people; he must have observed that the principle proclaimed by the Protestant creed makers, produced wherever it was adopted, its natural results: in religion, a swarm of sects; in biblical interpretation, a license before which the landmarks of even rational belief disappeared; and in society all the evils of unbridled fanaticism. Such has been the case particularly in Great Britain and Germany, and to a certain extent wherever the people were encouraged to decide for themselves what books belonged to the Bible, and to exercise their own judgment in ascertaining what those books meant. And when the reaction which always follows a period of turbulence, set in, it brought with it in this instance a spirit of irreverent criticism, which boldly challenged the credentials of written revelation, and concluded by denying the divine origin of every book in the Canon of Scripture. In Germany the rationalistic school of critics, made up of divines, philosophers, and philologists, all professional Christians, has during the last and present century exerted all its learning and talents to divest the Bible of its supernatural character. There is hardly a book of the Old or New Testament that has escaped the condemnation of those daring censors; Gaussen[1] himself an ardent Protestant divine bitterly deplores the pernicious influence, which their writings and lectures in the schools and universities of Germany have had on the minds of their youthful readers and pupils. In this unholy attempt to change the national belief in the Bible as a divine revelation, a prominent part must be assigned to Michaelis, Semler, Eichorn, Schmidt, Bertholdt, de Wette, Gue-

[1] *On the Canon of the Holy Scripture*, p. 496.

ricke, Schott, Credner, Neudecker, Reuss, Baur, Schultz, Schleiermacher, Schneckenberger, Lucke, Neander, Schwegler, Vogel, Cludius, Bretschneider, Weber, Schrader, Mayerhoff, Kern, Olshausen, Ullman, Huther, Lange, Paulus, Dahl, Diesterdick. To this list may be added an etc. as several others have attained more or less notoriety in the same unholy crusade against the Bible. Besides, these have a large following composed of disciples and imitators, in all countries where the principles of the Reformation were embraced; but notably in Great Britain, where that large class of nominal Protestants who devote themselves to the same anti-Christian task, hailed as an enlightened associate, Colenso Anglican bishop of Natal, declaring in the year 1862, that there are statements in the inspired volume which are not *historically true.*[1] And when still later in 1881, Professor Robertson Smith, then of Aberdeen, while engaged in a lecturing tour, felt at liberty to tell his hearers, mostly Presbyterians, that "the Pentateuchal history was written in the land of Canaan, and if it is all by one hand, it was not composed before the period of the Kings,"[2] with much more of the same sort equally inconsistent with the common belief of devout Protestant Bible readers, and subsequently published in book form; the same class of nominal Protestants regarded with indifference, if not with manifest sympathy, the onslaught then made on the word of God. Any man in England or Scotland who would have expressed himself thus regarding the Bible, in the days of the Cromwellians or Covenanters, would have been branded or burned as a heretic. In this matter British biblical critics have simply followed in the wake of those German free-thinkers, who advocate what is ostentatiously called "the higher criticism," a method of treatment which

[1] *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined*, p. 18.

[2] *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, pp. 321–322.

brushes aside the supernatural altogether as something absurd and superstitious, yet one which is applied to the inspired volume by not a few Protestant writers and thinkers in the United States, where the rule is with them to follow the religious views prevailing among Englishmen, as it has been of late the fashion among the latter to regulate their belief regarding the Bible by theories imported from Germany.

CHAPTER XLI.

The Old Testament deutero Books a part of God's Word.

All has now been said, that seemed necessary regarding the Canon of Scripture as regulated by Catholics, Jews, Schismatics and Sectarists. As we have seen, Catholics, Schismatics and Sectarists generally differ from the Jews by receiving as canonical all the books of the New Testament. But Catholics whose belief on this point, is, and has been always, professed by the Schismatics, whether before or since the latter became such, are at issue with Jews and Sectarists in declaring the deutero books of the Old Testament to be part of the sacred Scriptures. The next question, therefore, to demand special treatment is, whether these books are entitled to the same respect, and possess the same authority as the others, which, according to the common belief of Christians and Jews, were written under divine influence, in other words whether they are canonical or not.

In presenting the argument, by which the canonicity of the Books in question is established, it should be observed at the outset, that not only these, but several other books in either Testament, now considered canonical by almost all classes of Christians, were regarded with suspicion, and even excluded from the roll of sacred Scripture by some early Christian writers: and even three at least—the Canticle of Canticles, Ecclesi-

astes and Ezechiel [1] now included in the Hebrew Canon—were, if not absolutely rejected, at all events treated by some Rabbinical doctors in a manner which showed that the Jews were at one time by no means unanimous in regarding those books as canonical. As to Esther it is well known that in the second century the Jews had not that book on their canon.[2] Yet the Church herself, wherever her voice could reach or her mind be ascertained, was always known to hold and to teach that, whatever might be the opinion of individual Christian or Jewish writers, every book in the Canon approved by the Council of Trent constituted a part of the written revelation made by God.

Nor should it be an occasion of surprise, that in a matter of the kind some of her most learned and devoted members entertained and expressed opinions at variance with the practical belief of the Church, as illustrated in the teaching of her chief Pastors and in her liturgical books. For it was possible then for generations, even whole centuries, to pass, without that belief being so generally known, that only the illiterate, and such of the faithful as were far removed from the centres of ecclesiastical information, could be ignorant of it. The point was one, on which though over fourteen centuries had passed since the Bible had been completed, no judgment had been pronounced, which all could regard as final or indicative of the doctrine held by the Church Universal from the beginning. For during that period the question had never assumed so much importance, as to render a solemn decision necessary. Besides the circumstances, in which the Church often found herself, were not such as to enable her to express her mind on that question in tones, that no one could mis-

[1] Ibid.

[2] Kitto's *Cyclop.*, Vol. II., p. 186.

[3] Ibid. Vol. I., p. 522.

[4] Ibid. Vol. II., p. 875.

understand. It is also to be observed that Christianity had been propagated from the beginning, not by the reading but by the preaching of the Gospel,[1] and in fact is still mainly so propagated. That, as directed by its divine Founder, the doctrines of the Christian religion were to be promulgated throughout the world principally by oral teaching;[2] and that while there can be no doubt His Apostles in every instance taught their converts all that was necessary for salvation; and several of them have written on various subjects, they left behind them no certain digest, placed on record, no authentic summary even of the articles which Christians had to profess; as if they intended that the dogmatic and moral principles, which they inculcated should be preserved and transmitted to future generations by the same means, which they themselves, as instructed by their divine Master, according to the texts just cited employed with so much success.

And if that Creed, which goes by their name, was really written by the Apostles; the omission of all reference therein to the Canon of Scripture would seem to imply, that the point was one of those subjects, on which explicit belief was not then necessary; and which, should it ever become an occasion of controversy, was to be decided in the same way as the question regarding the observance of the Mosaic ceremonial[3] already settled by the Apostles themselves. But it was not necessary for the Apostles to declare explicitly what writings constituted the Word of God, or to leave behind them written instructions, whereby Christians of their own or succeeding generations would be prevented from confounding human with divine compositions. The very course, which they themselves adopted in this matter, indicated their views regarding it as clearly as any point expounded in the Gospels and Epistles, and

[1] Mark xvi. 15. [2] Mat. xxviii. 19, 20. [3] Acts xv.

constitutes a rule, which is certain to secure all who follow it against error in ascertaining the true canon of Scripture. For wherever churches were established, or congregations organized, they were generally provided with copies of the Scriptures containing the Old Testament and so much of the New, as was then written—the sacred Scripture being necessary for the use of the pulpit, the service of the sanctuary, and as a book of reference more or less indispensable to all engaged in the duties of the Christian ministry. And with the exception of those used in the Syrian Churches, which exception however soon disappeared, all those copies, as we have already shown on Protestant authority, were universally the Septuagint or translations made from it containing, be it remembered, several books now no longer found among the Jews. Yet, so far as can be known not a word was ever said by any of the Apostles, or their immediate successors to the faithful, intimating that those books were less sacred than the others contained in the text of the Hebrew as well as of the Septuagint. On the contrary as Dr. Davidson admits [1] "They (the Apostles) have expressions and ideas derived from them" (the deutero Books.) So that wherever Christianity was planted, East, or West, its professors, learned and ignorant alike, encouraged by the example, or at least the tacit consent of their Apostolic teachers, received as the written Word of God the entire collection of books which they found in the Septuagint.

Simple, earnest believers, as they were, those primitive Christians were as sure of this as that Christ was God, had died for their salvation, and had risen again from the dead. If in this matter they were mistaken, those who had converted them to the faith, and to whom they looked for example and instruction, must bear the blame. The question of the canon was, there-

[1] Encycl., Britt. *Canon of Script.*

fore, one on which their minds were made up, and if proposed for discussion could awaken no interest whatever among them. But how was it possible for the faithful generally to conceive such doubts, as would result in any discussion of the kind, when, by reason of the labor and expense involved in transcribing the Bible, very few of them could procure a copy of it, and still fewer were able to read it? For several centuries most of them lived, died, and it is to be hoped saved their souls without ever seeing the sacred volume, although they heard its words repeated in their liturgies, announced from their pulpits, and quoted by their teachers, and knew the history of the Old and New Testament as well as it is known at this day by the generality of Christians. The Church told them that the Bible, not as it was preserved among the Jews, but as her ministers read it in the Greek, or in a translation from the Greek, with the Books now, but not then disputed, or in any way distinguished from the others, comprised all that had been delivered to her as sacred Scripture by the Apostles, and they so believed. For they knew, as their fathers before them had known, that as followers of Christ they were to be guided in this matter as in all others by Christ's Church, not by the Jewish Synagogue. Catholics believe so still because the Church teaches so still; while English speaking Protestants prefer to hold that certain books included in the Bible then, as now by the Church, are "apocryphal," because King James and his translators declared them to be so. In this matter Luther led the way in Germany seventy-seven years before, and the consequence has been, that wherever his principles spread, the intelligent faith, with which Christian piety discerns God's autograph in every line of the Bible, if noticed by Rationalists or the advocates of what is complacently known among those writers as "the higher criticism," is greeted with the pity due to

invincible ignorance or sneered at as a degrading superstition.

In those early times, when the important functions of the copyist still seemed unlikely to be ever performed by any mechanical process such as the printing press, and books were as rare as they were unintelligible to the masses, some bishops or doctors possessing a library and a taste for speculative studies might turn their attention to subjects connected with the canon. But since even for them it was not a matter of life or death, nor an affair of heaven or hell, whether the Epistle to the Hebrews or the book of Hermas was to be considered a portion of the New Testament, provided they held the faith as taught by the Church and preached it to the people, such questions if discussed at all were mooted more for their relations to abstract truth than for any practical advantage that might thus accrue to the cause of religion. In fact most of the questions relating to the Scripture, though since clearly defined, were then matters on which conjecture was restricted by no limits except those traced by tradition—the only landmark at the time for the guidance of inquirers,—so far as the canon was concerned. And as the Church had not declared her mind on the subject it was impossible to say what was implied in that tradition. Whenever she should do so all were prepared to abide by her judgment, whatever might be their own private opinions, or the results reached by their own studies.

But it must not be supposed that until that judgment was pronounced nothing had been done to remove those doubts or to correct those mistakes relating to certain books, which had been occasioned by the speculations in which some early critics indulged. For it is certain, that both through her chief Pastors and the decrees of national as well as provincial councils approved by them, the Church as soon as the storms of persecution sub-

sided and she was at liberty to do her whole duty, did trace for the guidance of all a chart from which she herself never deviated, and which being subsequently promulgated in a more formal manner must, as it always has done since, have served to designate unerringly all those books which constitute the canon of Scripture. The doubts and mistakes here referred to extended to several books belonging to both the Old and New Testament, and now included in the Protestant as well as the Catholic canon. Some or all of them were absolutely excluded from the canon by some writers and regarded with suspicion by others. Besides these books there were others, which, though not found in the Catholic or Protestant canon, were assigned by certain Fathers some to the Old, others to the New Testament. And indeed quite a number of proto-books belonging to either Testament were, as we have seen, contemptuously repudiated by various Christian sects.

However, so far as the doubts and mistakes of ancient orthodox writers related to the Old Testament deutero books—the point with which we are more immediately concerned—they could not have been well avoided. For it appears it was not until the close of the second century, it may be the commencement of the third, that Christian scholars generally understood that their canon was more comprehensive than that of the Jews, which in some way unknown to all but the Rabbinical doctors had been already contracted by lopping off several books, which until the commencement of the second century had been long approved by the Hellenists and Palestinianists, or at least, tolerated by the latter, and which the Church had received from the hands of the Apostles. Not aware of the means by which, or the purpose for which the divergence between the two canons had been brought about, and supposing that that of the Jews had undergone no change, some Chris-

tian writers as soon as they made the discovery, appear to have suspected that the books no longer found among the Jews did not belong to the canon. With some of those writers this feeling amounted to no more than a doubt; with others it grew into a theory which derived strength from the fact, that the enumeration of the sacred books made by such illustrious scholars as Melito and Origen, though intended merely to exhibit the writings received by the Jews, was by some supposed to be a list of the canonical Scriptures approved by the Church. Under these circumstances hesitation and uncertainty must have been exhibited in some quarters, as the Church had not as yet formally expressed her mind on the subject, and especially as the advocates of Christianity—St. Justin Martyr, Origen and others—in their controversies with the Jews declined to cite the books in question. On such occasions these books could not be appealed to in proof of any doctrine held by the Christians but denied by the Jews. Or if appealed to by the former these were compelled to admit that testimony derived from such a source, whatever might be its intrinsic value among themselves, was for the time being extrinsically human. In other words they were reduced to the alternative of omitting all reference to these books, or of granting that under the circumstances they were not to be considered as possessed of that authority, which, in the opinion of both parties belonged to the other books. Such admissions, though justified by the nature of the case and made for the sake of argument, were probably construed by some into a denial of the divine authority possessed by the deutero books; and being, perhaps occasionally, made without any qualification by writers, distinguished no less for their orthodox views than for their literary attainments, must have influenced the belief of others who overlooked the circumstances in which those writers were placed.

Nor is it at all remarkable that in the absence of any authoritative declaration on the subject, illustrious saints and martyrs in those early times should have treated with the respect due to canonical writings, books that are now universally branded as apocryphal. The origin claimed by such of these books as were regarded with favor by some of the primitive Christians, the titles that they bore, and the character of their contents, were well calculated to deceive any one who had nothing to guide him but his own fallible judgment. Even then, however when the question of the canon was a comparatively unimportant one, and in fact received no attention outside the contracted circle of those to whom the study of the Scriptures was a specialty; not one of those who had access to the primitive and authentic sources of ecclesiastical knowledge, could have had any difficulty in selecting out of a vast accumulation of professedly sacred literature that very catalogue of books; which, after the impieties and absurdities of preceding sectarists had become crystalized in the errors of the Protestant system, and the authors of that system had adopted the Old Testament canon foisted on the deluded Jews by the perfidy of their astute Rabbins; was drawn up and approved by the Council of Trent on the eighth day of April in the year 1546.

After enumerating "all the books both of the Old and New Testament" of "both" of which "one God is the author," the Holy and Ecumenical Council adds: "But if any one receive not, as sacred and canonical, the same books, entire with all their parts, as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church, and as they are contained in the old Latin Vulgate edition .... let him be anathema." This decree is final for all Catholics, and ought to be so for all who believe that God has given the Scriptures as a revelation of His divine will to mankind.

First. Because it belongs to the Church to decide all questions pertaining to faith and morals.

Second. Because, according to the statements of those Fathers whose testimony is considered as most authoritative by all Christians, the right to declare especially what is or is not canonical Scripture is vested in the Church,

Third. Because, in determining the canon of Scripture particularly, the Church is infallible, a fact which in their own principles must be admitted by all who hold the Bible to be the Word of God, else their belief is irrational.

These points we proceed to prove, not by appealing to the Scriptures, which in discussing the same subjects are cited to good purpose by Catholic writers, as may be seen in their theological treatises and controversial works, but by addressing the common sense of thoughtful Christians. For, in fact among that class of believers the three propositions just stated must pass as little short of axiomatic, at least they must appear self-evident to all who have carefully perused the writings of the primitive Fathers as well as the contents of the Bible. Yet a word or so on the two first in this chapter. In the next chapter the attention of the reader will be directed to the third.

As to the first proposition; if it be asked, for what purpose does a man connect himself with a religious denomination? Is it not (the answer must be) that he may derive advantage from the instruction, which as a member he is to receive in faith and morals? And does it not follow from this, that the man in question practically admits that the denomination, to which he has attached himself, through its teachers, its approved books, its councils, its synods or conventions, has the right to instruct him; and that it is his duty, to regulate his belief and conduct accordingly, so long as he remains a

member of it? Now if such be the authority exercised by every sectarian organization, and freely conceded to it by all who claim membership therein, no reasonable person will deny, that it belongs to the Church to decide for Catholics, at least all questions, in which their faith or their morals are concerned. Hence as God's revealed *word* is as it were the standard for the regulation of Christian belief and practice, it is clearly the right, as well as the duty of the Church to declare at all events to Catholics what constitutes that *word*, and it is just as clearly a matter of strict obligation for all Catholics to submit unreservedly to her decrees on the subject. But an intelligent reader will go a step farther and maintain on the same irrefragable principle, that not only Catholics but Protestants are bound to hear the Church defining what is, or is not, Canonical Scripture. For when she did so, not only did she address all who claimed to be members of the Christian fold, but she declared, as we have seen, the belief of entire Eastern Christendom, as well as of, by far, the greatest part of Western Christendom. Her voice then was the voice not only of the Oriental Schismatics, but of the representatives of all nations, East and West at that time in communion with her. For they all in professing their belief in her Canon actually proclaimed it to be the identical instrument transmitted to them from all past generations. Whereas those, who drew up the Protestant canon, represented none but themselves and their followers in England and Germany, between whom the canon (if even it) was almost the only point of doctrinal agreement. And that canon was different from the one they had received from their forefathers; so that when offered to the East, it was, as we have found, summarily and scornfully rejected by that large and ancient section of Christendom. Nor has it been ever, nor is it now, received by all Protestants as it issued from the

hands of its authors. And after all what right had those men who formulated the Protestant canon of the Old Testament to stamp *canonical* on some books, and *apocryphal* on others? Not more than their followers who claimed none whatever, but simply and blindly followed their leaders. The latter, so they confess, rejected certain books because they were rejected by contemporary Jews, and doubted by some early Christians. To be consistent those mutilators of the canon should have denied the divinity of Christ, because that was denied all through by the Jews, and denied also by what was for a long time a numerically respectable class of Christian sectarists. Beyond the very questionable example of the Jews, who of course rejected the whole of the New Testament, and the hazy testimony of a few early Christian writers the mutilators had no warrant for the conclusion they reached, if we except a liberal use of sophistry, assumption and misrepresentation. On the other hand those who at Trent drew up a catalogue of canonical books, besides being humanly speaking pre-eminently fitted for the task, and inheriting the learning and traditions handed down in ancient churches, some of them coeval with the Apostles, claimed in their conciliar capacity to be guided in their utterance by the Holy Ghost. With people swayed by their prejudices that claim may not amount to much. But the reasonable Protestant trained to habits of reflection will admit, that without it the Bible is no more to mankind than any other book, and will hesitate before he condemns as apocryphal, writings approved by the Catholic Church.

Our second proposition will not be denied by many unprejudiced scholars, who have devoted any attention to patristic studies. Yet, in order to convince the general reader of its truth, a few citations must be made from the works of some among the earliest and most respectable Christian Fathers, who have written on the sub-

ject. And therefore our inquiry will be confined to the statements of writers, who lived between the second and fifth centuries, a period, during which such ordinances, as the Apostles had enacted for the progress and preservation of the Church, could not have lost much of their force or have become utterly obsolete.

Our first and earliest witness is St. Irenæus the Martyred Bishop of Lyons, in Gaul. He was a disciple of St. Polycarp, himself a disciple of St. John the Apostle. Born early in the second century at Smyrna, of which city Polycarp was Bishop, Irenæus was afterwards promoted to the See of Lyons. He was thus enabled to become familiar with the rules and traditions prevailing in Western as well as Eastern Christendom. In at least one part of his writings, [1] he has taken occasion to refer to what he calls "the greatest and most ancient church, known to all, founded and established at Rome by the two most glorious apostles Peter and Paul," and declares that "with this church, on account of her most powerful principality, it is necessary that every church, that is, the faithful, who are on all sides, should agree, [1] in which (church), by those who are on all sides the apostolic tradition has been always preserved." [2] Observe, our illustrious witness does not say, that all churches should *agree* together, or that the Church at Rome should *agree* with the Church at Jerusalem, or the Church at Antioch, or the Church at Jerusalem or with all other churches singly or collectively, but that *every church* that is *the faithful on all sides* as church members should *agree* with the Church at Rome, on account of her more powerful *principality*—sovereignty, superiority, pre-eminence.

Elsewhere [3] Irenæus says that the bishops and priests

[1] *Adv. Hæres.* l. III, c. iii. § 2.

[2] Vide Kenrick on the *Primacy of the Apostolic See*, p. 86. note and *The Faith of Catholics* vol. II. p. 3. note.

[3] *Adv. Hæres.* L. iv. c. xxvi. s. 5. Ibid. c. xxxii. s. 1.

safely expound the Scriptures to us, and that if any one believes in one God who made all things..... he begins at a point, whence he may reach the true religion: all of which will be brought to his knowledge, if he reads the Scripture with those, who are the priests in the Church and possess the apostolic doctrine. It appears therefore from these and other statements of our Saint, that when he wrote, the Scriptures were generally used and explained by the Clergy to the people, and that they existed in a well known collection. Irenæus also states,[1] that they were corrupted, mutilated, and distorted by the heretics of his day, so that for many it must have been difficult to say, what was or was not scripture; what was or was not its meaning. Under these circumstances various questions connected with the Scriptures must then have pressed for a solution. We dare not say, that the limits of the sacred records had been clearly defined when Irenæus wrote, or that what we understand by the canon of Scripture had been already formulated. But let us suppose, that any controversy had arisen on this or any other point connected with the Scripture, how was that controversy to be settled? Irenæus answers, by every Church, that is the faithful everywhere, agreeing with the church at Rome. According to this rule, whenever a Pope from Peter, who first governed the church at Rome to Paul III. under whose pontificate the Tridentine canon was approved, either appealed to the deutero books, or actually pronounced them canonical, and several of them did one or other; every christian throughout the world was bound to accept such action, as the only standard by which he was to regulate his belief concerning the canon of Scripture.

Now let us hear Tertullian on the same subject. This celebrated African scholar commenced his career in the latter part of the second century, and died in the early

[1] Ibid. L. I. c. 1. s. 3. Ibid. c. III. s. 6. Ibid. L. II. c. xix. s. 8, etc.

part of the third. In his writings he has dwelt on several points already treated by Irenæus, notably that one, to which we have just referred. Tertullian's rule for the determination of doctrine is substantially identical with that laid down by Irenæus. The only difference between them arises from the difference of classes, by which the rule was to be applied. Irenæus wrote principally for the churches and the faithful in their diocesan capacity. Tertullian's instruction was intended for Christians generally as individuals, few of whom could communicate with the Church at Rome; and he therefore directed them to consult the nearest apostolic church, that being no doubt in his opinion the same as to consult the Roman Church, with which all other Apostolic churches were then necessarily in communion. But let us hear Tertullian himself: "Come then, you, who wish to exercise your curiosity to better advantage in the affair of salvation; run over the apostolic churches in which the very chairs of the apostles continue to preside over their own places, in which their authentic letters are read, echoing the voice, and representing the face of each one. Is Achaia near you? you have Corinth. If you are not far from Macedonia you have the Philippi, you have the Thessalonians. If you can go to Asia, you have Ephesus. If you are near Italy, you have Rome, whence we also derive our authority. How happy that Church, to which the Apostles poured forth their whole doctrine together with their blood, where Peter passed through the Lord's passion, where Paul is crowned with the death of John,[1] where the Apostle John, after emerging safely out of the boiling oil into which he had been plunged, was banished to an island, let us see what she learned, what she taught, since she provided the African churches also with the countersign." [cum Africanis quoque ecclesiis contesserarit][2] Thus the individual

[1] The Baptist.

[2] Liber *De Præscrip.* c. xxxvi.

enquirer after truth, in Tertullian's opinion, might apply to any of the Apostolic churches to which he was nearest; but more especially to Rome prëeminent among all the rest for so many reasons—Rome, with which all the other churches were then so closely linked in the bonds of Christian unity. And had that enquirer been anxious to ascertain the true canon of Scripture according to Tertullian, he had to seek for information from the same quarter.

But Tertullian's statements made elsewhere[1] for the purpose of marking the distinction between genuine and spurious scriptures are still more to our purpose. "To sum up" says he "if it is certain that that is truest which is most ancient, that most ancient which is even from the beginning, that from the beginning which is from the Apostles; it will in like manner also be certain, that that has been handed down by the Apostles, which shall have been held sacred by the churches of the Apostles. Let us see what milk the Corinthians drained from Paul; after what rule the Galatians were reformed; what the Philippians, the Thessalonians, the Ephesians read; also what the Romans close at hand trumpet forth, to whom both Peter and Paul left the Gospel sealed also with their blood. We have also the churches that John taught. For although Marcion rejects his Apocalypse, nevertheless the succession of bishops counted up to their origin, will stand by John as the author..... I say therefore that Gospel of Luke which we are principally defending, holds its place, from the first of its publication, amongst the churches, not the apostolic alone, but all who are covenanted with them by the fellowship of religion; whilst that of Marcion is to most not known, and known to none except to be condemned..... The same authority of the apostolic churches will defend the other Gospels also, which accordingly we have through these churches,

[1] *Adv. Marcion.* l. iv. c. 5.

and according to these churches, I mean the Gospel of John and Matthew, etc."

Tertullian knew of but one way by which the Scripture as a divine record could be defended against its assailants, and that was by appealing to the teachings of the churches, not the apostolic alone, but all others in communion with them, in other words to the doctrine held by the Church in her corporate capacity. Was not this the plan adopted in the sixteenth century, when it became necessary to vindicate the integrity of the New as well as the Old Testament against the impious attempts of the Marcions, who appeared at that time?

Origen also, who was born at Alexandria in 185 and died at Tyre in 255, made use of the same method for ascertaining the genuine Scriptures. In his celebrated answer to Africanus, who had urged against deutero Daniel several objections no doubt then and certainly afterwards[1] popular among the Jews, Origen after a brief introduction says: "Know, therefore what we ought to do, not merely with regard to what relates to Susanna, which, according to the Greeks, is circulated in Greek throughout *the whole Church of Christ*, nor as regards, as you have stated the case, the two other sections which are at the end of the Book (of Daniel), written about Bel and the Dragon, neither of which is written in the Daniel of the Jews, but also with regard to countless other portions of the Scripture," of which portions he gives several examples. Then he ironically tells Africanus that "It is time, therefore, unless these things are hidden from us, to reject the copies circulated in the churches, and to make it a law for the brotherhood to set aside the sacred books circulated amongst them, and to flatter and persuade the Jews in order that they may communicate them to us, pure and free from what is false. Has then, that providence which, in the holy

[1] Vide, *Jerome Pref. to Daniel.*

writings has given edification to the churches of Christ, had no care of those who had been *bought with a price, for whom Christ died; whom though His Son, God, who is charity, spared not but delivered Him up for us all, that, with Him He might give us all things?* Moreover, consider whether it is not good to bear in mind that saying: *Thou shalt not remove the everlasting land-marks which thy forefathers have set.*"[1] Farther on Origen remarks incidentally that "the Jews do not use the book of *Tobias*, nor that of *Judith*, for they have not them even in their apocrypha in Hebrew as I have learned from them: but since the *Churches use Tobias*, we ought to know that in the captivity," etc.[2]

How indispensable Origen considered the authority of the Church as a means, indeed the only means of ascertaining the genuine Scriptures, appears still more clearly from what he has written regarding the Gospels. Thus Eusebius[3] relates that Origen "in the first book of his commentaries on St. Matthew's Gospel attests that he knows of only four Gospels as follows." 'As I have understood from tradition respecting the four Gospels, which are the only undisputed ones in the whole Church of God.' The principle here insisted on is more fully expressed in his first Homily on St. Luke's Gospel, where he says "There are only four approved Gospels, from which dogmas are adduced under the person of Our Lord and Saviour. I know a certain Gospel according to Thomas, one according to Mathias, and we have read many more, on account of those who think they know something, if they know them. But in all these, we approve of nothing else than, *what the Church approves, that is, that only four Gospels are to be received.*" As much as to say out of the innumerable Gospels now in circulation I select but four, Matthew's, Mark's, Luke's, and John's; and that solely because

[1] § 4. [2] § 12. [3] *Hist. Eccles.* L. vi., c. 25.

the Church directs that only these four are to be received.

Here it is right to observe that the fact for which we are contending, is further proved by all that has been written throughout the period included in the present enquiry, to demonstrate the existence and necessity of doctrinal unity in the Church. On that point Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Justin, Clement of Alexandria, and others including the three to whose authority reference has just been made, have insisted with great earnestness. But in the mind of those and succeeding Fathers, doctrinal unity implied a certain fixed symbol, with all that logically flowed from it, since without such symbol, as they urged, the existence of a Church is inconceivable. Now the Church being professedly based on a divine revelation communicated in certain writings, her symbol or creed must contain an explicit declaration as to the nature and extent of that revelation, as soon as it is known that God has made it. This no one can reasonably deny. In fact all Protestant denominations are now generally agreed among each other as to the limits and nature of written revelation. In order, therefore, that the Church should be one in belief, as the Fathers maintain, it became necessary that as soon as the collection of divine writings was completed and brought to her knowledge, she should have a canon of Scripture, else her doctrinal unity would have been but a delusion. But the Fathers all contended that she was really invested with this divine characteristic, and it therefore evidently follows, that when they argued, as all of them did, that unity was a fundamental principle in her constitution, and should be cherished and maintained by all her children; they meant thereby to say that all were bound to accept her canon of Scripture whatever that was, and to repudiate every other instrument of the same kind as unauthorized. When, therefore, we hear

Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage who suffered martyrdom in 258, urging the faithful to "repel and shun every man whoever he be, who separates from the Church," adding that "whoever isolates himself condemns himself,"[1] and remarking in his letter[2] to Antonianus a Bishop of Numidia in reference to Novatian, a then notorious heretic, that "we ought not to be curious as to what he teaches *outside* (the Church); whosoever he be, and whatever he be, he is no Christian who is not in the Church," one may reasonably conclude that the holy martyr would have had no patience with any proud spirit, who dared to reject sacred writings received by the Church, for that would be teaching *outside*. And every student of patristic literature is well aware that such sentiments were common to those great saints and writers, who in early times ennobled their faith by their virtues, or defended it with their pens.

A candid inquirer will also find, that St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, who died in 386, though by telling his disciples to "read the divine scriptures, these twenty-two books of the old testament" he seems to adopt the then Jewish canon; yet as he adds "immediately" which (twenty-two books) the seventy-two interpreters translated"[3] shows that his canon was Alexandrine or Tridentine, especially as the Septuagint is known to have included the deutero books when he wrote, and he himself admitted, nay insisted, that "that translation was the product not of human knowledge, but of the Holy Spirit, and effected by the inspiration of that Holy Spirit by whom the scriptures were dictated."[4] Besides, with Cyril as with the other Fathers, in discriminating between Scripture and Scripture the authority of the Church was paramount for all. "Learn also diligently and from the *Church*" he says "what are the books of

[1] *Liber de Unitatie Ecclesiæ*. xvii.
[2] §. xxiv.
[3] *Cateches*, l. iv. §. xxxiii.
[4] Ibid. §. xxxiv.

the old Testament; what those of the New?"[1] So that were it certain that Cyril, through ignorance of the canon used by the Church, followed that of contemporary Jews, there can be no doubt, that, when better informed, he would have received as canonical the books rejected by the existing synagogue, but admitted by the Church. Besides he did himself in his own writings actually appeal to the authority of those books, when he found therein anything bearing immediately on the questions, with which he was dealing. Farther on[2] after describing the history of the Septuagint, and insisting on its inspiration, he repeats: "Read those twenty-two books, have nothing to do with apocrypha. Study carefully those alone, which we read carefully in *the Church*" (for Cyril as for all else the rule in the matter was the practice of the *Church*) "far wiser and religious than you were the Apostles and ancient bishops, these rulers of the Church, who handed them down; do not falsify what has been settled."[3]

Lucifer, Bishop of Cagliari, in Sardinia, whose death occurred in 370, was distinguished not only for his learning, but for his strenuous opposition to the errors of the Arian faction. That the Church in the Council of Trent, or on any other occasion, *could* have canonized books merely human, must have seemed to him, as it has to a large majority of Christians at all times, absurd as well as impossible. For he maintains that "the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, who was in the prophets, remained also in the Apostles, which same Holy Spirit *since He is in God's church*, and you (Arians) are outside God's Church" etc. All who, believe the Christian Religion to be anything more than a human system of ethics will subscribe to Lucifer's statement. When the Protestant canon appeared, wherever the Church was

[1] Ibid. xxxiii. [2] Ibid. xxxv. [3] *Catechesis.* iv. §. xxxv.

De non parcend, in Deum delinquent, (Bibl. Ma. Pat. Tom. iv. p. 237.

there was the Holy Ghost. That is certain. But where was she? At Trent or at Wittenberg? And who represented her? The bishops of christendom or Martin Luther? Common sense alone, supplies a ready answer.

When a mere fraction of Christendom rejected the canon of the Catholic Church, on what side let us ask would the Father have ranged himself, who wrote "My resolution is, to read the ancients, to try every thing, to hold fast what is good and not to recede from the Catholic Church."[1] Who can read the reference to St. Jerome by the Anglican establishment in its 6th Article, without denouncing it as a foul libel on the fair fame of an illustrious writer? who, if he ever meant to make the Jewish canon his own before and especially after he wrote his prefaces, showed that he was Tridentine to the core;—a writer, too, whose rank Romanism displays itself in the following noble words addressed to Pope Damasus.[2] "I have thought that I ought to consult the chair of Peter, and, the faith that was commended by the mouth of an Apostle .... Following no chief but Christ I am joined in communion with your Holiness, that is, with the chair of Peter, upon that rock I know that the church is built..... Whosoever gathereth not with thee, that is; whosoever is not of Christ is antichrist." The reader may imagine with what scorn St. Jerome, who died in 419, would have regarded the impudent appeal to his authority by the Anglican framers of the thirty-nine articles, had he been living at the time.

Let us now see what in reference to our second proposition has been said by St. Augustine, who died in 430. After speaking of the preparation by which one becomes a most skilled interpreter of the sacred writings he proceeds to observe: "Now, in regard to the

[1] *Jereme Ep. ad Minerv. et Alexand.* § 11.

[2] Ep. xv. § (1. 2).

canonical Scriptures, he must follow the authority of the greater number of Catholic churches; and among these of course a high place must be given to such as have been thought worthy to be the seat of an Apostle and to receive epistles. Accordingly, among the canonical Scriptures he will judge according to the following standard: to prefer those that are received by all the Catholic churches to those which some do not receive. Among those again, which are not received by all, he will prefer such, as have the sanction of the greater number and those of greater authority, to such, as are held by the smaller number and are of less authority. But if he should find that some books are held by the greater number of churches, and others by the churches of greater authority (though this is not very likely to happen), I think that in such a case the authority on the two sides is to be looked upon as equal."[1] In making this statement Augustine must have intended to say, either; in what way one who knows not what books constitute the canon of Scripture is to ascertain those books, or, having already discovered that, how he is to determine their relative value. For that on the latter point, there is a difference, as any one will admit, between the Gospels and the rest of the New Testament, as well as between the Pentateuch and the book of Esther for example. Besides, Augustine having made the statement in question immediately adds "Now the entire canon of Scripture, in regard of which we say that the above considerations are to be applied is comprised in these books." Here follows the Tridentine catalogue. Now this last remark seems to imply that "the skilful interpreter" who as such ought to know the extent of the inspired text has already really made up his mind on that subject, and needs to know the relative value of the different classes of sacred books, a point on which Au-

[1] *De Doctrina Christiana.*—L. ii. c. viii. §. 12.

gustine takes care to expatiate, as he proceeds with his catalogue. It matters little, however, which of the two meanings actually reflects the thought of Augustine, when he wrote the statement, since he maintains throughout that "the skilful interpreter of the sacred scriptures" must "in regard to the canonical scriptures follow the *authority* of the greater number of Catholic churches;"[1] and that *authority* is known absolutely and without the possibility of mistake when the Catholic churches act as a unit, as they did at Trent, there solemnly proclaiming that to be the only true canon of Scripture which was contained in the Bible, as it had circulated all along throughout the East as well as the West, and which had come to Augustine as it had to all other Fathers from those apostolic men, who here and there were among the first tillers of the Lord's vineyard. But aside from all this it is certain that Augustine firmly held, that "the right to declare especially what is or is not canonical Scripture is vested in the Church." For he declares "I, for my part, would not believe the Gospel, unless the authority of the Church moved me to it."[2] and almost in the same breath adds "who the successor of Christ's betrayer was we read in the Acts of the Apostles; which book I must believe if I believe the gospel, since both writings rest alike on the testimony of the Catholic Church."[3]

The testimony rendered on the point before us by St. Isidore of Pelusium, who died in 440, agrees with that of Augustine. "Now the sacred volumes," says he, "which contain the testimony of the divine Scriptures, are like ladders, by which the ascent to heaven is made. Wherefore all those, which are proposed in the Church,

[1] "In canonicis autem scripturis, ecclesiarum catholicarum quamplurium auctoritatem sequatur."

[2] *Contra Ep.. Fundament.* cap. v.

[3] Ibid.

receive as tried gold, they having been purified, as by fire, by the divine spirit of truth. But leave aside whatever books circulate outside this volume."[1]

In harmony with the teaching of all these Fathers is the doctrine proclaimed in the year 400 by the First Council of Toledo in these words: "If any one shall say, or shall believe that other Scriptures, besides those which the Catholic Church has received, are to be esteemed of authority, or to be venerated, let him be anathema."[2]

It is therefore evident, that during those early ages, when the Christian religion according to the general belief of intelligent Protestants remained substantially what it had been in the time of the Apostles; the right to distinguish between divine and human writings, to say what books were canonical, what apocryphal, was believed on all hands to belong exclusively to the Church. So much for our second proposition.

[1] L. I. *Ep. Cyro.* ccclxix. (Bib. Max. Pat. Tom. vii. p. 570.)

[2] Can. xii. coll. 1228. T. II. Labb. *Concil.*

CHAPTER XLII.

THIRD AND LAST. THE TRIDENTINE CANON TRUE AND UNIMPEACHABLE, ELSE A BELIEF IN THE DIVINITY OF THE BIBLE IS IRRATIONAL.

Our third proposition, paradoxical as it may seem to many, is not less true; and can hardly be considered less reasonable than either of the other two by reflecting Protestants, who still believe, without doubt or hesitation, that the Bible is the Word of God. For if the Church be not infallible in deciding what is sacred Scripture, it follows that it has never been and never will be declared by *competent* authority, that the Bible is a book, indeed the only book, of which God Himself is the Author. We say *competent* authority, meaning thereby a formal decision emanating from a tribunal supernatural in its constitution and inerrable in its judgments. On this point we insist, since it is evident that mere human testimony is wholly inadequate to prove that the Bible is, as all Christians believe, not the production of fallible man, but of the infallible God. To believe, for example, that the epistle ascribed to Barnabas was really written by that apostle and is veracious is one thing; to believe that that epistle is canonical is another thing altogether. The genuineness and credibility of any book, whether really or only professedly sacred scripture, are questions with which, before it is authoritatively placed on the canon, human testimony is competent to deal. But whether a book be canonical or

not is one, which mere human testimony cannot decide. Were the autograph of the Epistle said to have been addressed by St. Paul to the Laodiceans discovered, and evidence at hand proving it to be the work of that Apostle; it would not therefore be canonical, that is, a book whose contents were dictated by the Holy Ghost, and therefore to be followed as a guide in faith and morals. For it might not treat of either. And whether it did or not; as no merely human tribunal is capable of deciding in all cases what according to conscience is to be believed, what is to be done or not done; the question would be one, on which an infallible tribunal would have to pass judgment; else it would remain forever a matter of doubt and conjecture: and this the more so as the canonicity of a book implies its inspiration, a point certainly to be decided by God Himself, or those whom he may have delegated for the purpose.

Testimony, therefore, in all respects purely human, though often sufficient to test the genuinness and credibility of written documents, can never lead to that degree of certainty, which is absolutely necessary; when it is to be decided whether they are to be admitted to a place among the canonical scriptures. Yet Protestants have no better warrant for believing that the books in their Bible are canonical; and must, if they would avoid the imputation of blind fanaticism, admit that Richard Baxter,—one among the few honest old preachers of whom they can boast,—told the plain, unvarnished truth, when referring to the method by which Protestants "prove scripture the word of God," he confessed that "godly ministers and Christians tell them so, it is impious to doubt it, and therefore they believe it."[1] Water can never rise higher than its source without the application of a force outside itself. So the human testimony of even "ghostly ministers,"

[1] *Saints Rest.* Part ii. Chap. ii. p. 159. Carter's ed. N.Y. 1855.

or for that matter, of all the sects they represent, without supernatural assistance, which they do not, because they cannot claim, has never been and never will be able to furnish an intelligent Protestant with what, he might consider, a conclusive and satisfactory proof of the canonicity commonly claimed by Protestant christians for the books contained in their bible.

So much for the value of external human testimony as bearing on the canonicity of the Scriptures. But what about the internal evidence which the scriptures themselves render in favor of their own canonicity? Well. This exactly. Such evidence, whatever it be, is simply human; to say that it is anything more is to assert what has to be proved—that the books of the Bible are canonical. Among men of common sense, whatever, be their creed, it is therefore a settled point that the canonicity of the books in the Bible cannot be established by anything contained in the Bible. In fact during the palmiest days of Protestantism, when the very punctuation of the Bible was believed by the enthusiastic admirers of the reformation to be the work of God; "There were differences among themselves" says Protessor Smith of Aberdeen "as to the value of the Apocrypha (deutero scriptures) on the one hand, and as to the canonicity of Esther and some other books on the Old canon on the other."[1] And it is well known that Semler[2] and his school in Germany has made sad havoc of the Protestant canon in that country. Neither can the canonicity of a single book in the Bible be proved by any thing recorded therein as spoken by Christ, or written by the authors of the Old or New Testament. To assert the contrary is equivalent to saying; that a contested will proves its own genuineness, when there is no one to verify the signatures of the witnesses or that of the

[1] *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church.* p. 42.

[2] Kitto's *Cycl.* vol. 1. p. 377. (canon).

testator; or to testify that in his presence or hearing, the latter directed that such disposition should be made of his estate as the instrument in question expressed.

To many it may seem little short of impiety, to argue that nothing said by Our Lord, nothing written by any of His Apostles, or by any of those to whom we are indebted for the Old Testament, can demonstrate that the books of the Bible are canonical. But let us look at the Bible as rational beings. The entire Bible was not finished for many years after Our Lord had disappeared from the world; and neither Himself nor His Apostles are now present to bear testimony to the contents of that volume. Besides, since first written it has been copied and translated times without number, sometimes faithfully, but often far otherwise, as the state of the text abundantly proves. Thousands of years have passed, not only since its first book was written, but since every autograph of every Old Testament book especially has disappeared, when and how no one can tell. And the fate that has befallen the original copies of the Old, has long since overtaken those of the New, at most within a few centuries after the last of its inspired writers had passed away. Besides, the contents of the whole volume are such, that even if we suppose the text to be now what it was originally, it would be possible for readers of all grades to draw, as they do at present, the most contradictory conclusions from its perusal; while several of its books are assigned by eminent modern critics to other authors than those to whom they are commonly ascribed, or whose names they generally bear; and the origin of other books once supposed by all and still believed by some to be the productions of writers, whose names are as familiar as household words, has been so obfuscated by the exegetical disquisitions of those learned critics, that, were their author's to return to earth they could hardly expect to secure a

copyright. Simple souls used to turn to the Epistle to the Hebrews and draw instruction and consolation not only from the reading of its contents, but from the belief, that they were perusing a genuine letter written to the men of his race by the great Apostle of the Gentiles. But they must believe so no longer, for "F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S., and chaplain in ordinary to the Queen" tells[1] them in the year of grace 1882 that that Epistle was not written by St. Paul, nor even by an Apostle, but by Apollo; the idea of its Apollonian origin having been hatched in the seething brain of Luther.[2] Such remarks from a royal chaplain are not likely to shock the feelings of the English Protestant public, for it has been long accustomed to more irreverent criticism by high dignitaries in the Anglican communion. Few, however, were prepared to hear that the rationalistic theories imported into England from Germany had crossed the borders; and were enthusiastically reechoed in the Kirk o' Scotland. Yet such is the case, for the Aberdeen professor cited above, as appears from the preface to his work, "on the invitation of some six hundred prominent Free Church men in Edinburg and Glasgow," delivered in those cities "during the first three months of the present year" (1881) "twelve lectures" on "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church;" "and the average attendance in the course in the two cities was not less than eighteen hundred;" a fact which shows that what the lecturer calls "progressive Biblical science," or the "newer criticism" meets with considerable favor among a large and influential class of his countrymen. As a specimen of this so called "science" and of the consequence resulting from the substitution of human for the divine authority claimed by the Church in reference to the Bible, we

[1] *The Early Days of Christianity*, pp. 182, 183.

[2] Ibid. 187.

select the following from many similar statements advanced by the advocate of the "newer criticism" in his series of lectures. "As a matter of fact the Pentateuchal history was written in the land of Canaan; and if it is all by one hand, it was not composed before the period of the Kings."[1] And "The Pentateuch then, was not written in the wilderness, but moreover it is not now in its narrative parts a single continuous work, but a combination of several narratives originally independent."[2] Scotch Calvinism is doomed, for the time is probably not far distant, when the disciples of John Knox, if they have not already done so, will subscribe to the belief proclaimed by an Anglican Bishop in 1862, viz: "that the narrative of the Pentateuch, whatever may be its value, cannot be regarded as historically true."[3] Yet among educated readers this is the logical and inevitable result of discarding the authority of the Church for mere human testimony, as the sole key to the solution of the many problems connected with the written word of God. Others, who on human testimony alone still persist in believing that the Bible is not only historically true but divinely inspired, do so in defiance of the plainest principles dictated by common sense.

The treatment which the Bible receives from that large class of German, English, and American Protestants, represented by the writers named above, and in fact from intelligent Protestant readers generally, is subversive of a principle, without which Christian civilization could not be maintained. For it is only when mob rule and violence have usurped the place of law and order, that the superior is subjected to the judgment of the inferior, or that the private citizen dares to question the authority of a law pronounced constitu-

[1] Ibid. pp. 321, 322. [2] pp. 324, 325.

[3] *Pref. to the Pent. and Book of Josua,* by Rt. Rev. John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal, p. 20.

tional by the public tribunals. Unless in times of social disorder when legitimate power has been superseded by lawless and irrepressible force; the law, as set forth and interpreted by the judge for the time being, is above the person or the case brought before his tribunal whatever may be the dignity of that person, or the importance of that case. But as if the Protestant system was religious anarchy or the creed of lunatics, this is all reversed the moment an advocate of that system attempts to deal with the Bible according to his own principles. For the Bible, until he becomes an infidel, is for him as the word of God, a divine code, whose meaning, scope, and limits, he has no right to define. For him to attempt that is illogical, revolutionary, and impious. He dare not so trifle with the laws of the civil community to which he belongs. And who will say he is at liberty, to sit in judgment on the law of the Lord.

We readily grant that it is not only lawful but laudable for a Christian to examine the reasons why the Bible is to be received as the word of God; why, for example, this or that book is considered canonical and that other not, since in this matter, as well as all others pertaining to his religious belief it is not unquestioning credulity but intelligent faith that is expected of him. To engage however in such an enquiry with the intention of arguing that the Bible is not what it is commonly taken for; or with the expectation of proving that it is destitute of any of those characteristics, without which it would be nothing more than a human production—though a task which an infidel might consistently undertake—is one which a Christian of whatever creed must decline, so long as he remains such. Yet as if the Bible were no more than it is to a disciple of Voltaire or Tom Paine, the Protestant arraigns before the bar of his own reason every book of which it is composed; and presumes to decide whether it is canonical or not; thus putting the

human above the divine, and subjecting what he believes to be, or at least has some reason to suspect, may be, the oracles of God, to the capricious judgment of a mind perhaps warped by invincible prejudices, at all events, fallible by nature and limited in its range of knowledge.

It will not do to say that his judgment is confirmed by that of all other Protestants at or since the Reformation, and of the Jewish people both before and since the time of Christ; even were such the case, a point, which not only can never be proved, but is untrue. For the opinion of all those Protestants and Jews as to the Old Testament canon is for the Protestant enquirer nothing more than human testimony; and is to be entirely disregarded, unless we are prepared to say that the word of God is to be tested by the word of man. It, therefore, follows that it is irrational for the Protestant to believe that the books in his Bible are canonical, unless he believes this because the Church says so. And this he must do, otherwise for him there is no such thing as canonical Scripture; because the word *canonical* implies a characteristic which lies in the plain of the superhuman, and is therefore beyond the range of the most trustworthy testimony which man can offer; and one of those points about which none but a superhuman witness, or a human witness divinely appointed can testify. But the Church is the only such witness, and therefore every Christian whether Protestant or Catholic, before he can logically accept any book as canonical, must have her assurance that it is so.

Now there are many considerations, some of which will convince any intelligent and unprejudiced person, that this assurance may be relied on as trustworthy; others that will enable him to see that it gives absolute certainty. Thus the Scriptures of both the Old and New Testament, whatever the books that compose them, were delivered to the guardianship of the Church by the

Apostles. This is admitted on all hands, as we have already seen. But has she been faithful to her trust in this matter? Has she preserved these Scriptures substantially as they were delivered to her? Of this there can be no reasonable doubt. The copy she uses and approves of is called the Vulgate. Besides this, there are in existence, the copies of the Hebrew Scriptures possessed by Christians as well as Jews; and innumerable other copies in various languages; many of these copies being very ancient, and others comparatively modern. The Vatican library possesses a copy [1] of a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, the first ever made into any language, and antedating the birth of Christ by nearly three hundred years. The copy itself belongs to the middle if not the beginning of the fourth century within our era. St. Petersburg is enriched with another copy [2] of that translation. It is supposed to have been written almost as early as the preceding. The British museum contains a third copy [3] of that translation as old as the fourth or fifth century. And the National Library at Paris comprises among its literary treasures a fourth copy [4] which is generally assigned to the fourth century. Besides these copies belonging to the fourth or fifth century, there are numerous others of various translations proceeding from the earliest

[1] *Codex Vaticanus* in the Vatican Library, Rome.

[2] *Codex Sinaiticus* found by Tischendorf in St. Catharine's Monastery, Mount Sinai.

[3] *Codex Alexandrinus* brought from Alexandria in Egypt by Cyril Lucar, who presented it to Charles I. of England.

[4] *Ephræm rescriptus.* It is a palimpsest; and is so called, because, as it appears, a copy of the Scriptures having been first, written on the parchment, and the letters having either faded or been removed, the parchment was again used for copying some of St. Ephrem's works. In the course of time the double purpose which the parchment was compelled to serve was discovered, and the copy of St. Ephrem's works having been removed by a chemical process, the original copy of the Scripture, which the parchment contained, was partially restored.

version of the Hebrew Scriptures, and made into the many languages spoken by Christian nations and tribes—the Syriac, Græco Veneto, Memphitic or Coptic, Thebaic or Sahidic, Bashmuric, Arabic, Ethiopic, Persian, Georgian, Slavonic, Gothic, Armenian; translations more or less complete, and written at different dates between the first and ninth century; for the number includes the *Peshito*, a production very probably of the first century. The works of early Christian writers have also preserved for us innumerable quotations from the Bible, as it existed in their time and in their respective countries. Now a comparison between the vulgate on the one hand, and all these translations and copies of translations and patristic quotations on the other, will prove that no change of any consequence has occurred in the text, which the Church has followed as a standard; that it is, to all intents and purposes, identical with not only the text preserved among the Jews, but with that, in which the contents of the Bible have been translated into the various languages spoken in all those countries, where the Christian religion was long ago established, and where it is still professed, or has been corrupted by triumphant schism. The versions just mentioned, contain all of them, so far as known, the Old as well as the New Testament deutero books—the-*Peshito*[1] alone excepted, as it wants most of the deutero

[1] *Simple* as the word is generally interpreted. It is the oldest of the Syrian versions, and comprised originally only the Old Testament proto books, though the deutero books of that part must have been soon added; as they are frequently cited by St. Ephrem, a Syrian writer of the fourth century. At first the II. Ep. of Peter II. and III. Eps of John, Ep. of Jude and the Apocalpse were not contained in the Peshito New Testament. For these books as they are now found in that version, seem to have been added subsequently as if the Syrian Churches had not received them at the same time with the others; or having received them had in accordance with the teaching of Theodore of Mopseustia rejected them for a time; but at last when better informed restored them to the canon.

found in the New as well as all the deutero belonging to the Old Testament, the latter having been translated from the Hebrew into Syriac probably at a time, when the Jews had already reduced their canon to its present dimensions. This exception, however, only strengthens our argument. For, though differing from the Church's standard copy of the Scriptures as to the number of Old Testament books, the *Peshito*, as to its text, coincides substantially, so far as it goes, with the text of that standard; thus proving as do all the other translations and copies, each having those books which were originally wanting in it, that the Church has all along sedulously and successfully guarded the purity of the sacred text. Strange would it not be, had she been less careful to preserve the integrity of the sacred volume itself, or allowed its limits to be stretched beyond the lines fixed by those inspired men who delivered it to her keeping.

And let it be further observed, that the propagation of the Gospel everywhere among nations once heathen but now Christian, has been the work of the Church. That whatever there is valuable in modern civilization is fairly to be ascribed to her influence. That the equality of all men before God was first insisted on by her. That life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness were first declared by her to be the right of every human being. That had it not been for her, slavery would still, be as it once was the condition of a great part of mankind. That woman from being the chattel was made by her the companion of man. That by the Church was laid, and is still preserved the only sure foundation, on which the integrity of the Christian family and the sanctity of Christian marriage can be maintained. And that even her enemies must admit, that the cause of Christian morality and of Christian charity has ever found in her its most eloquent advocate, often its sole successful pro-

moter. Surely that man must be beyond the reach of argument, who cannot be convinced by such facts, that the testimony of the Church, declaring that any particular book of the Bible is canonical, is entitled to that degree of respect which inspires entire confidence.

But there are other facts, which, if examined in the light, reflected on human affairs by a belief in God's providence, must lead not only to a feeling of confidence, but to a positive conviction, that when the Church solemnly announces that certain books are canonical, her judgment is to be regarded as infallible. Thus of all the civil and religious institutions, which existed in the Apostolic age, or were founded for centuries afterwards throughout the length and breadth of Christendom, she is the only one that still survives. And during the long period, over which her history extends, she has passed through trials far greater than those, which proved fatal to all else. For she has had to contend with the unsparing ridicule of a cynical philosophy, with the blind fury of unpitying paganism, and the fierce passions of untutored barbarism. And, as if she were an enemy to the peace and happiness of mankind, she has been outlawed in the decrees of legislatures and the edicts of rulers. At one time Emperors and Kings have endowed her with princely possessions, have done public penance at the bidding of her Bishops, and have even condescended to hold the stirrup of her chief Pastor. At another they have stripped her of everything, massacred her ministers; and when they did not force on him the crown of martyrdom, have dragged her supreme Head from his See, thrust him into prison, or driven him into exile; that the shepherd being struck his flock might be scattered, and the Church be thus annihilated, or made subservient to the state. But in every struggle of the kind the Church triumphed in the end, and resumed her divine mission, while her persecutors, one by one at

last passed to their final account. Such is the lesson which history teaches, and such the problem presented in the checkered career of the Church. Let materialists solve that curious problem if they can. They have tried to do so, but failed, overlooking or ignoring the fact that the Church as the Bride of Christ, must have, like her Spouse, a divine as well as a human side. In the latter as He was, she is vulnerable, in the former like Him she is impassible. In her what is human is not beyond the reach of her enemies. But against the divine element, implanted in her nature by God not even the gates of hell can prevail. On no hypothesis, that excludes this view of the case, is it possible to account for the mysterious vitality, which she has exhibited throughout her long and eventful history. Her very existence in view of the trials, through which she has passed alive, but not always unscathed, is, therefore, *prima facie* evidence, that when she declares in her magisterial capacity, what is and what is not canonical Scripture, she declares the truth and nothing but the truth.

But this is not all. For among the many motives, which a reasonable man may have for believing, that the only canon which he can safely adopt, is that which has been approved by the Church, there is one which may appear to many minds, more cogent than any yet mentioned. Be this as it may, it probably had more to do in the conversion of nations, than all others combined. Most, in fact, all of those nations, which, either during or since the time of the Apostles, embraced the Christian religion, in doing so renounced the gross errors, which then constituted the creed of all but the Jews; and abandoned the inhuman forms of vice, to which the infidel classes of mankind have been at all times addicted. This doctrinal and moral change is implied in the profession of faith required from all converts to Christianity. And wherever the cross was planted, that change took

place at the suggestion of strangers, who, however irreproachable in their lives, possessed neither worldly wealth nor worldly influence; and in point of human learning were even far inferior to many of their disciples. Besides they had nothing to offer, as a substitute for the sensual charms and mythological attractions, which paganism possessed for its deluded votaries; except a religion, whose creed was mainly composed of inscrutable mysteries, while its moral principles were at war with those corrupt tendencies of human nature, to which the heathens yielded with the same ease, as they did to their physical necessities; and its rewards nothing more than the consolation of a good conscience, with the hope of a happy death, and a blissful eternity, blessings then too often unattainable, unless through imprisonment, exile, or martyrdom. And just as the advocates of that religion had engaged in a forlorn hope, its founder, for so it was rumored, had died the death of a malefactor; in fact, they admitted this, for it was too well known to be concealed; although they averred He had again risen from the dead, and even had the audacity to declare that this point so inconsistent with human experience and sustained by no testimony but their own, should be believed by their hearers, nay, insisted that to do so was an indispensible element in the creed, which their converts were to profess even unto death. For it is certain there is no article of the Christian creed, on which the Apostles laid so much stress, or which they so persistently urged on the acceptance of Jews and Gentiles, as the doctrine of Our Lord's resurrection. Yet, incredible as it may seem, the Christian religion with its abstruse mysteries, its numerous facts, humanly speaking impossible, and its rigid code of morals was embraced in the life time of the Apostles, by multitudes of all classes at Rome, Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Corinth, Ephesus, in a word, at all the principal centres

of population within the Roman Empire, and even at points outside its limits.

For the success of a religious movement, which like Mohammedanism or Mormonism appeals to the base passions of human nature, it is easy to account. But unbelievers have never been able on their own principles to offer a satisfactory explanation of the unparalleled revolution, which swept over the world, permanently changing the belief and morals of mankind; when the Apostles went forth to preach the Gospel. It is only in the light of the New Testament that we can discover the forces, by which that revolution was pushed forward and has been kept in motion ever since. That sacred record reveals what appears to us, and what must appear to every reasonable man, the principal motive power which propelled outward and onward the Christian religion, until it reached the hearts and homes of mankind; when it declares, that the preaching of the Apostles was everywhere, accompanied by signs and wonders, such as the healing of diseases the raising of the dead to life, miracles and nothing less.

Now the conversion of nations is a work, which, we know did not cease with the Apostles. It was continued long after their time, and, in fact is still carried on. Is it not, therefore, reasonable to suppose, that wherever the work has been successful since; the converts, who have been gathered into the fold of the Church, have been convinced, that the Christian religion alone was true and that it was their duty to embrace it, by the same arguments that produced conviction among those, who were the first to take the same step in Judea and other parts of the Roman empire, as well as elsewhere. Human nature has been the same since, that it was then. And if the manifestation of divine power was indispensable to the success of those, who were the first to preach the Gospel; there is every reason to suppose

that the labors of those who undertook and accomplished the same task among the same class of people elsewhere, required and received a similar sanction from God. If, therefore, ecclesiastical, and may we not add, profane history, as it certainly does, records numerous instances of miraculous intervention in favor of those, who, like the Apostles, succeeded in propagating Christianity among infidel nations; it is nothing more than what we should expect.. Why should Judea be the only theatre for the display of God's power, when even more urgent reasons existed for its manifestation, wherever else the same work was to be done. For among all nations converted to the Christian religion, after as well as during Apostolic times, the principles of that religion must have been considered far more objectionable, because much more opposed to the popular belief, than they appeared to the people of Judea. Among the latter, however they might regard it, Christianity was in truth no more than the fulfilment of the promises made to their fathers, and the actual complement of the national creed. Its scriptures included their scriptures, and its God was their God. Among the former it was a totally new and generally unheard-of system, which aimed at the extirpation of all other systems, the subversion of the public temples, the destruction of the national idols, the burning of all books objectionable to it, and the renunciation of magic, sorcery, and all other occult and superstitious practices, to which the Gentile world was addicted.

Why then should the Apostles, of all those, who discharged the same functions, be considered the sole depositories of miraculous power; especially as the difficulties to be encountered, the opposition to be overcome and the necessity for a class of proofs indicating the sanction, the presence and the power of God were, at least, as great in the case of many others, who accom-

plished similar results? Even if ecclesiastical history made no reference to post-apostolic miracles, surely God might fairly be supposed to have employed all along, in the conversion of pagan nations, the same means, by which Jew and Gentile had been brought into the Church at first. We know that miracles were then among the means, were indeed the principal means made use of, if not the main argument appealed to for that purpose. But we are not told, nor is it anywhere even intimated, that the pôwer to perform them was afterwards to be withdrawn; or that those, who should be called to the same mission, were to convince their hearers by evidence different from that, without which, as we all admit, the task undertaken by the Apostles must have failed. Wherefore; were the history of those missionaries, who, for example, preached with success the Gospel in China and Japan, or converted nations at some time subsequent to the Apostolic age, to reveal nothing of a kind with those stupendous prodigies described in the Acts of the Apostles, our disappointment would be great indeed. But such is not the case. That history proves, that the age of miracles has not ceased, and that God is as ready as ever to exert His omnipotence in attestation of the truth when announced to infidel nations by those, whom He has called to teach in His name.

Exclude if you will whatever seems legendary or fabricated in ecclesiastical history, or in the biographies of God's saints. Yet a large number of portentous facts will remain, which are so well attested, that if we discredit them, we must, to be consistent, reject as incredible whatever is known to us only through human history, or believe only that, of which we have personal knowledge, if even that much. Besides we must be prepared to explain, how it is possible, that all those respectable, intelligent, and disinterested persons, who in many instances witnessed with their own eyes several

of those portentous facts, and so testified in the most solemn manner, could have been mistaken themselves, or disposed to impose on the credulity of others. In either case the phenomenon would be a most abnormal one, in fact as much a miracle as the point in dispute. When, for example, unbelievers assert that the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius is no miracle, or that the stupendous prodigies which confirmed the mission of St. Francis Xavier in Japan, and were subsequently pronounced miracles by a competent tribunal, after a most searching juridical process, never occurred; let those incredulous critics tell us, how it is possible, that all those—Protestants as well as Catholics—who from time to time, still bear testimony to the changes that take place at Naples under the power of prayer in the blood of the martyred Bishop of Benevento, can be deceived; and that those, who solemnly deposed to the signs and wonders, even the raising of the dead to life, which signalized the labors of Xavier in Japan, could have been mistaken. To suspect fraud on the part of the witnesses in either case is preposterous. And if they were mistaken or deceived. Then why, or how? The question has never been answered. The deception of the senses in such circumstances would be itself a miracle, something not only unparalleled in the history and experience of mankind; but contrary to the laws, by which God governs the universe; belonging not, like the stupendous facts just cited, to the physical but to the moral order; and therefore as conflicting with God's providence far more astounding than any event recorded in sacred or ecclesiastical history. To all but an atheist or an agnostic a moral miracle, if we can conceive such a thing, involves a contradiction; a physical miracle does not, and is therefore at least conceivable.

Materialists in their method of reasoning, therefore get over one difficulty by involving themselves in a

greater. That method, to use a homely expression, is simply jumping out of the frying pan into the fire. It thus appears that the prodigies mentioned in the annals of the Church and in the Lives of the Saints, are, many of them inexplicable, unless they are recognized as miraculous facts designed by God's Providence, to attest His own power, presence or sanction. It is in this way that God bears testimony not only to the divine mission of those whom He calls to preach the gospel; but to the truth of the doctrines taught by the Church which they represent, while fulfilling that mission. When therefore, the Church in order to prevent or check the growth of error, and defend the integrity of God's written revelation, stamps with her sanction a canon of Scripture; would it not, we ask, be most unreasonable to reject such canon on the belief or suspicion that she was mistaken in including certain books therein, or excluding others therefrom?

Whatever may be thought of these reasons, whether they are considered sufficient to demonstrate that the Books approved by the Church in the Fourth Session of the Tridentine Council constitute the only complete and authoritative canon of Sacred Scripture; or are rejected as inconclusive for that purpose; it is evident that no Christian, be his creed what it may, can on logical grounds believe that there is any such thing as a written revelation from God to man, and that the contents of certain specified books constitute that revelation; unless first assured by an infallible authority that such is the case. For books of that character are presumably above human reason, else they would not contain truths known to God alone, such truths being of the very nature of a divine revelation. They must also be above the reach of mere human testimony, for that is restricted to facts within the natural order, whereas the books in question profess to be supernatural in

their origin, aim, and contents. Human reason may suffice for its own sphere. The evidence of distinguished writers, intelligent critics, and respectable witnesses may be trustworthy so far as it goes. And the solemn judgment of this or that sect, or of all the sects combined may be more or less probable. But what does it all amount to? Human testimony, confessedly fallible, limited to what is of the earth, earthy, and therefore utterly incompetent to decide that writings, which claim to have God for their author, are really to be received as such.

The first converts to Christianity believed that there was such a revelation, as we speak of; and that it was contained in certain well-known books. Yet they did not believe that as a conclusion of human reason, or as a fact established by human testimony; but as a doctrine taught them either by God Himself, or His duly accredited representatives the Apostles. Their conduct in the matter was that of rational beings; for they yielded assent, only when they were presented with proof lying in the same plain with the thing to be proved. For the testimony of the Apostles, so far as they were teachers, was not human, but superhuman, even divine. That was nineteen centuries ago, when men are supposed to have acted without much deliberation and with less judgment. Is it not therefore strange that in this age of boasted enlightenment, Christians are to be found, who ignoring the principles of sound reason, and disregarding the dictates of common sense, believe that God has made a revelation, and that the Bible contains it, on evidence which is infinitely inferior to that which secured the assent of the first Christians. Yes on evidence of a kind, which if applied to the Iliad, would hardly suffice to prove that it is the work of Homer, or that it has a historical basis. No wonder that wherever the Protestant Reformation took

root, there should be found a large and constantly increasing class of "advanced thinkers," as they complacently call themselves—all Protestants by their traditions, training, education, sympathies, social relations; Protestants, we say, in all respects except their religious belief—who unable to find such testimony, as will convince a reasonable man, that the Bible is the word of God; and not knowing where to look for that testimony, have reached the conclusion, that the common belief regarding that book is a popular delusion, which must sooner or later be dispelled under the light of the higher criticism, or corrected by the diffusion of general knowledge.

The course of those "thinkers," though it has led them to infidelity, is at least logical. And this is more than can be said of those, who still cling to the belief, that the Bible is infinitely superior to any human production, though the testimony, by which this belief is supported, is confessedly human; or though it be, as all of them not yet fit for bedlam must admit, a mere hallucination "like the inward work of the Holy Spirit." For if God has made a revelation to mankind, as Protestants hold to be the case; it necessarily follows that they are bound to regulate their belief; and so far as it refers to morals, their conduct by it, else that revelation would not have been made. But before they take a single step in the regulation of their belief and conduct according to this standard, they must know what the revelation is. According to their own principles, God requires them to take His revelation as a guide in doctrines and morals. But He would not be just, if He left them without such means as would enable them to find with absolute certainty what He has revealed. That means cannot be human testimony, such testimony being as we have just seen wholly inadmissible in the case. Testimony of the same grade with that, on which the primi-

tive Christians believed, that the writings delivered to them by the Apostles contained God's revelation to the world, is the only kind of testimouy, on which the Protestants can, consistently with common sense and their own eternal welfare, accept the Bible as the word not of man but of God.

To an intelligent Protestant, therefore, either the Bible is no more than any other book, or its claims to a higher rank must be proved by a witness, whose testimony is infallible. But where shall he find such a witness? In human reason? No. In human testimony? No. In any or all of the Sects? No, they all answer, No. In the inward work of the Holy Spirit? No, though lunatics answer, Yes. Nowhere in the wide world is such witness found, nowhere is such witness claimed to be except in the One, Holy, Roman Catholic Church. She has professed all along and professes still, on grounds satisfactory at least to all her children because consonant with reason, to speak with infallible certainty on the canon of Scripture, as well as on all other revealed doctrines. And every Christian whatever be his creed, unless prepared to stultify himself, must either take her at her word, or deny that the Bible is the word of God. For him, so long as he remains what he is, there is logically no half way house. If he denies the infallibility of the Church, and starts from this denial as his *terminus a quo*, his *terminus adquem* is infidelity. Should he be resolved come what may, to maintain that the Bible is a divine revelation; but like an honest man determined to satisfy himself that it is so without a reasonable or possible doubt, he must sooner or later conclude that the Church is infallible; and that that is the only true canon which has received her approval. For if the Church be not infallible, no man can have a motive for believing with absolute certainty that God has made a revelation, and that it is contained

in this, or that other book, or any particular collection of books.

Concluding Remarks.

In bringing this volume to a close the author takes occasion to say, that as the reader is doubtless aware by this time, the main object aimed at from first to last has been to prove that the canon of the Old Testament is that catalogue of books, of which, together with those of the New Testament, the Council of Trent in its Fourth Session declared that "God is the Author." For this purpose it has been argued in the course of the work, that the Jewish High Priest under the Old Law was charged by God to guard the sacred writings; and to decide as other writings appeared from time to time whether they were to be added to the collection already made—a divine trust which must have outlived the Jewish pontificate, and according to analogy have been transferred to the High Priest in the Christian dispensation. It has also been contended that all the evidence connected with the subject tends to demonstrate, that at the advent of the Redeemer the canon of the Old Testament was contained, not in the present Hebrew Bible but in the Septuagint; and that it was this latter copy of the Old Testament which the Apostles, guided by the Holy Ghost, left with the Churches which they founded. That the Apostles did so seems indisputable in view of the fact, that not only the Roman Church founded by SS. Peter and Paul, but all those schismatical communities which at first maintained communion with that Church, but ceased to do so, most of them more than a thousand years ago; find their canon of the Old Testament solely in the Septuagint or in a version of it, instead of in the existing Hebrew Scriptures. In fact,

East as well as West this is still, as it was the case, everywhere, until Martin Luther and his Protestant disciples borrowed the Jewish canon in the sixteenth century, a time, when that canon was no longer what it had been when the Redeemer lived among men, or when the Apostles delivered the Scriptures of the Old as well as of the New Testament to the Christian Church.

That the object aimed at in this volume has been attained, it would be presumption in the author to assert. The point is one which must be left to the judgment of each reader, who after weighing all the arguments will decide for himself. But surely no Christian, and least of all a Protestant, can regard with indifference the question discussed in the preceding pages. The Bible is justly regarded the Book of Books, the best of all books; because it alone has God as its Author. It has been written for our instruction and edification; that by reading and meditating on its contents we may be enabled through the grace of God to live well, and die well, and be happy forever. Whether therefore we have the Bible, and have it as it was written by God, is a question that concerns us all, a question which demands immediate and profound attention, especially from every one who is not absolutely certain that he has in his Bible all those sacred books, which the Christian Church received as such from those by whom she was founded. For, until he is convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that his Bible is complete, every Christian has a right to suspect that it does not embrace all truth which God requires him to believe; or that books contained in other Bibles but omitted in his may explicitly set forth some revealed doctrines, which being but vaguely, perhaps not at all referred to in the books in his canon, he therefore doubts if he does not actually deny and doubts or denies to his own condemnation.

The canon of the Old Testament, if thoroughly dis-

cussed, implies the treatment of various other subjects one way or other connected with it. Several of those subjects have received attention in the present volume; but perhaps not so much as their importance demanded. More however could not have been given them consistently with what was aimed at—a book of moderate dimensions. Throughout the discussion of the principal question considered in the preceding pages, the reader will find that the sentiments expressed by eminent writers, whether Christian or Jewish, who reject the Tridentine canon of the Old Testament, have been fairly stated, indeed generally in their own words; and that the references in each case have been plainly, it is hoped correctly indicated in the foot notes. Rarely has an appeal been made to the Christian Fathers, or to the action taken by Ecclesiastical Councils in reference to the compass of the Old Testament, and hardly has any attention been devoted to objections derived from such sources. Because to have done so would have required at least another volume, which may or may not according to circumstances be written hereafter, although materials are already at hand for the purpose.

APPENDIX.

As the matter is one, on which some readers might desire information; it has been decided to add to this volume lists of the books found in the oldest manuscripts of the Greek Bible, a list of books given in the oldest Graeco-Latin manuscript of the Scriptures, and three other lists of books contained in Bibles which are neither Greek nor Latin, and are used by schismatics each being written in a different language. One of these Bibles is a descendant of a version made from the Septuagint probably as early as the fourth century; another also a version of the Septuagint—appears to have circulated all along among a wide-spread religious community, ever since it seceded from the Church in the fifth century; the third is evidently a copy of a version, in like manner made from the Septuagint about the ninth or tenth century, when the ancestors of the people who now use it were converted to the true Faith by missionaries in communion with the Holy See. The Greek manuscripts referred to are the *Vatican,* the *Sinaitic,* the *Alexandrian,* the *Ephremi Rescriptus,* the Graeco-Latin, or *Claromontonus.* Of the three other Bibles just mentioned, one is the *Ethiopian,* the second the *Chaldean,* the third the *Russian.*

The *Vatican Codex,* so named because it is preserved in the Vatican library at Rome, is supposed by the great majority of the best critics to belong to the beginning or middle of the fourth century. A distinguished Protestant scholar,[1] well qualified by the nature and range of his studies to decide on the relative merits of manuscripts declares that the *Vatican* manuscript "on the whole may be pronounced to be the most

[1] Dr. Westcott, *the Bible in the Church,* p. 305.

correct copy of the Greek Bible." It has been executed in extremely fine antelope skin in uncial letters so exquisite, as to rival the most graceful productions of the printing press. Each page is divided into three columns unaccented and unpunctuated. It has no space between the words unless occassionally where one narrative is succeeded by another. As at first written, it appears not to have had at the beginning of any book a letter larger than the rest, which were all of uniform size and style. But at the beginning of the Gospels, the letters traced by the first scribe have been superseded by larger ones, the work of a later hand, which has also carefully restored such letters as had become faded or obscured by use or age.

This precious relic of christian antiquity has been often collated and published. Under Pius IX. a splendid edition of it was prepared by Fathers C. Vercellone and J. Cozza. And quite recently the latter Father stimulated by the encouragement of Leo XIII. has succeeded in photographing a few copies of it. Very little is known of its history, though it appears to have formed part of the Vatican treasures since the fifteenth century; and is supposed by some to have been brought there from Constantinople by Cardinal Bessarion. It may, therefore, be one of the fifty superb copies, which, Eusebius as directed by Constantine the Great, prepared for the Churches of Constantinople. At all events it is old enough to be coeval with Constantine, while the magnificent style in which it has been executed is quite suggestive of imperial patronage. It is very much to be regretted, however, that this, by far the most valuable manuscript, which we possess of the Septuagint, is mutilated, wanting as it does some leaves at the beginning, middle, and end. The books and parts of books which it still contains are the following:

OLD TESTAMENT.

Genesis. (a fragment).	*Josue.*	*III. Kings.*
Exodus.	*Judges.*	*IV. Kings.*
Leviticus.	*Ruth.*	*I. Paralipomenon.*
Numbers.	*I. Kings.*	*II Paralipomenon.*
Deuteronomy.	*II. Kings.*	*III. Esdras.* (apocryphal.)

OLD TESTAMENT. (*Continued*).

I. Esdras.
II. Esdras. (or Nehemias.)
Psalms, (parts deficient.)
Proverbs.
Ecclesiastes.
Canticle of Canticles.
Job.
Wisdom.
Ecclesiasticus.
Esther, (with the additions.)
Judith.
Tobias.
Osee.
Joel.
Amos.
Abdias.
Jonas.
Micheas.
Nahum.
Habacuc.
Sophonias.
Aggeus.
Zacharias.
Malachias.
Isaias.
Jeremias.
Baruch.
Lamentations.
Epistle of Jeremias. (Baruch vi.)
Ezechiel.
Daniel. (with the additions.)

NEW TESTAMENT.

Matthew.
Mark.
Luke.
John.
Acts of Apostles.
Epistle of James.
I. Peter.
II. Peter.
I. John.
II. John.
III. John.
Jude.
St. Paul to the *Romans.*
" " " " *I. Corinth.*
" " " " *II. Corinth.*
" " " " *Galatians.*
St. Paul to the *Ephesians.*
" " " " *Philippians.*
" " " " *Colossians.*
" " " " *I. Thessal.*
" " " " *II. Thessal.*
" " " " *Hebrews.*
(as far as ix. 14, where the MS. ends.)

The *Sinaitic Codex* was discovered by Tischendorf in 1814-1815, at the monastery of St. Catharine on Mount Sinai, hence its name. It was conveyed to St. Petersburg where it still remains. In age and excellence it ranks next to the Vatican, being generally considered a production of the fourth century, but much of what it contained when written has been since lost. It differs from the Vatican by having its pages divided into four instead of three columns. Yet like the Vatican it is written continuously and in uncial letters of uniform size, being also unpunctuated and unaccented. Following are the books, and parts of books which it contains:

OLD TESTAMENT.

Paralipomenon. (Fragments.
II. Esdras, (that is *I. Esdras*, a fragment, and *Nehemias.*)
Esther, (with additions.)
Tobias, (almost entire.)
Judith, (almost entire.)
I. Machabees.
II. Machabees.
I. Isaias.
Jeremias.
Lamentations, (as far as ii. 20.)
Joel.

OLD TESTAMENT. (*Continued*).

Abdias.	*Aggeus.*	*Ecclesiastes.*
Jonas.	*Zacharias.*	*Canticle of Canticles.*
Nahum.	*Malachias.*	*Wisdom.*
Habacuc.	*Psalms.* (151.)	*Ecclesiasticus.*
Sophonias.	*Proverbs.*	*Job.*

NEW TESTAMENT.

Matthew.	*Ephesians.*	*Epistle of James.*
Mark.	*Philippians.*	*I. Peter.*
Luke.	*Colossians.*	*II. Peter.*
John.	*I. Thessalonians.*	*I. John.*
Epistles of St. Paul.	*II. Thessalonians.*	*II. John.*
Romans.	*Hebrews.*	*III. John.*
I. Corinthians.	*I. Timothy.*	*Apocalypse.*
II. Corinthians.	*II. Timothy.*	Epistles of *Barnabas.*
Galatians.	*Philemon.*	*Shepherd.* (fragment.)

The *Alexandrine Codex* is named after Alexandria the City where it was probably written. It has been executed in beautifully formed uncial letters of similiar size and style. But certain divisions of the Gospels are marked at the beginning with letters a little larger than the rest. Its words are without any intervening space and are unaccentuated and unpunctuated, with the exception of a point above the last letters in the last word of a section. Each page is divided into two columns. This valuable manuscript has been assigned to the end of the fourth century, but by only a few critics. For by the great majority of the best scholars, Protestant as well as Catholic, it is believed to have been executed not before the fifth century. The various chasms which occur in it show that it too has suffered considerably in the lapse of ages. Its history as far as known is briefly told. The notorious Cyril Lucar, while schismatical Patriarch of Alexandria obtained possession of it, and having in spite of all competition secured the schismatical patriarchal See of Constantinople brought it there with him. In the execution of his plans for introducing Protestant principles among the Greeks, he understood that it was his interest to secure the good will of the English government. And as a means to that end, delivered the manuscript to Sir Thomas Roe, then English Embassador at the Sublime Porte, with the

request that that gentleman should present it as a gift to Charles I. King of England. There it was placed in the Royal Library, but afterwards was deposited in the British Museum, where it is still preserved, having been often published. Following is the account which Cyril himself has given of the manuscript in a Latin statement annexed to it.

"This book of the Sacred Scripture of the New and Old Testament, as we have it from tradition, was written by the hand of Thecla a noble Egyptian lady about one thousand three hundred years ago, a little after the Council of Nice. The name of Thecla has been written in the end of the book: but Christianity having been extinguished in Egypt by the Mohammedans, the books of Christians were reduced to the same condition, and therefore the name of Thecla is extinguished and lacerated, but memory and recent tradition do still preserve it.

CYRIL PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE."

The *Alexandrine Codex* still contains the following books:

OLD TESTAMENT.

Genesis.
Ecodus
Leviticus.
Numbers.
Deuteronomy.
Josue.
Judges.
Ruth.
I. Kings.
II. Kings.
III. Kings.
IV. Kings.
I. Paralipomenon.
II. Paralipomenon.
Osee.
Joel.
Amos.
Abdias.
Jonas.
Micheas.
Nahum.
Habacuc.
Sophonias.
Aggeus.
Zacharias.
Malachias.
Jeremias. (Including Baruch, Lamentations and Epistle—Baruch VI.)
Daniel. (With the additions).
Esther. (With the additions).
Tobias.
Judith.
III. Esdras. (apocryphal)
Esdras. (Including Nehemias).
I. Machabees.
II. Machabees.
III. Machabees.
IV. Machabees.
Psalter. (With preface of Athanasius to Marcellinus, Hymns of the New Testament and Prayer of Manasses).
Job.
Proverbs.
Ecclesiastes.
Canticle of Canticles.
Wisdom.
Ecclesiasticus.

NEW TESTAMENT.

Matthew.	*Ep. Jude.*	*Ep. I. Timothy.*
Mark.	" *of St. Paul to Romans.*	" *II. Timothy.*
Luke.	" *I. Corinthians.*	" *Titus.*
John.	" *II. Corinthians.*	" *Philemon.*
Acts of Apostles.	" *Galatians.*	" *Apocalypse.*
Ep. of James.	" *Ephesians.*	I. *Epistle of Clement.*
" *Peter.*	" *Philippians.*	II. *Epistle of Clement.*
" *II. Peter.*	" *Colossians.*	(Last part defective
" *I. John.*	" *I. Thessalonians.*	and followed by a
" *II. John.*	" *II. Thessalonians.*	chasm.)
" *III. John.*	" *Hebrews.*	*Psalms of Solomon* xviii.

Ephremi Codex rescriptess, a manuscript preserved in the National Library at Paris and supposed by Tischendorf to be somewhat older than the Alexandrian, originally contained the Sacred Scripture, but was afterwards used for copying some of St. Ephrem's tracts. When this was discovered, efforts were made to restore the original writing; but these efforts were only partially successful. However, it has thus been shown that, while the manuscript contained fragmentary portions of all the books of the New Testament, it still retained unmistakable traces also of Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, *Wisdom*, and *Ecclesiasticus* in the Old.

Codex Claromontanus now in the National Library at Paris, is named after Clermont in France where it was found by Beza. It is a bilingual manuscript of the sixth century, being executed in Greek and Latin. It contains most of St. Paul's Epistles in both languages and nothing else. After the Epistle to Philemon it gives in Latin "the lines of the Holy Scripture," and as it does so, names each book, indicating at the same time the number of "lines" it contains. These numbers are here dispensed with as of no practical importance. The books named are the following: [1]

OLD TESTAMENT.

Genesis.	*Josue.*	3. *Kingdoms.*
Exodus.	*Judges.*	4. *Kingdoms.*
Leviticus.	*Ruth.*	*Psalms.*
Numbers.	1. *Kingdoms.*	*Proverbs.*
Deuteronomy.	2. *Kingdoms.*	*Ecclesiastes.*

[1] Westcott, *the Bible in the Church*, p. 309

OLD TESTAMENT. (*Continued*).

Canticles.	*Osee.*	*Judith.*
Wisdom.	*Daniel.*	*Esdras.*
Wisdom of Jesus. (Ecclesiasticus).	1. *Machabees.*	*Esther.*
12. *Prophets.*	2. *Machabees.*	*Job.*
	4. *Machabees.*	*Tobias.*

NEW TESTAMENT.

4. *Gospels.*	1. *Timothy.*	2. *John.*
Matthew.	2. *Timothy.*	3. *John.*
Mark.	*Titus.*	*Jude.*
Luke.	*Colossians.*	*Epistle of Barnabas.*
Epistles of Paul to	*Philemon.*	*Revelation of John.*
Romans.	1. *to Peter.* (Thus).	*Acts of Apostles.*
1. *Corinthians.*	2. *to Peter.* (Thus).	*Shepherd.*
2. *Corinthians.*	*James.*	*Acts of Paul.*
Galatians.	1. *John.*	*Revelation of Peter.*
Ephesians.		

It will be noticed that several proto books belonging to both the Old and New Testament are omitted in the list, while but one Old Testament deutero book, Baruch is wanting. But as Jeremias is one of the omitted books, Baruch usually considered part of it is of course omitted also. Why these omissions? perhaps from inadvertence; perhaps because the scribe in the copy which he followed did not find that the lines of the omitted books were numbered, that being probably his principal reason for giving the list.

The *Ethiopic Version*,[1] as the one in use among the Abyssinians is called, is a translation of the Septuagint and Greek New Testament into their principal dialect the Gees (liberal). It was made in or soon after the fourth century. For it was then the Abyssinians embraced the True Faith. And, although, they have very generally since become monophysites, their Bible appears to have undergone no material change. As a version of the Septuagint, it may be presumed to contain all the Old Testament deutero books. Yet, it is deemed right to produce here as briefly as may be a list of contents. The following therefore are the books preserved in this venerable bible:

[1] Vide Walton, *Proly.*, xv. 10. Hody, *De Bible Text*, p. 650. Cornely Introd. in S. Script., vol. i. p. 379. Kitto *Cycl.*, vol. i. p. 669.

OLD TESTAMENT.

Genesis.	*Judith.*	*Amos.*
Exodus.	*Esther.*	*Abdias.*
Leviticus.	*Job.*	*Jonas.*
Numbers.	*Psalms.*	*Micheas.*
Deuteronomy.	*Proverbs.*	*Nahum.*
Josue.	*Ecclesiastes.*	*Habacuc.*
Judges.	*Canticle of Canticles.*	*Sophonias.*
Ruth.	*Wisdom.*	*Aggeus.*
I. Kings.	*Ecclesiasticus.*	*Zacharias.*
II. Kings.	*Isaias.*	*Malachias.*
III. Kings.	*Jeremias.*	*I. Machabees.*
IV. Kings.	*Lamentation.*	*II. Machabees.*
I. Paralipomenon.	*Baruch.*	*Enoch.* (No certain evidence that this book is considered canonical by the Abyssinian Christians).
II. Paralipomenon.	*Ezechiel.*	
I. Esdras.	*Daniel.*	
II. Esdras. (Nehemias).	*Osee.*	
Tobias.	*Joel.*	

NEW TESTAMENT.

Matthew.	*Ephesians.*	*Hebrews.*
Mark.	*Philippians.*	*James.*
Luke.	*Colossians.*	*I. Peter.*
John.	*I. Thessalonians.*	*II. Peter.*
Acts of Apostles.	*II. Thessalonians.*	*I. John.*
Epistles of St. Paul to Romans.	*I. Timothy.*	*II. John.*
	II. Timothy.	*III. John.*
I. Corinthians.	*Titus.*	*Jude.*
II. Corinthians.	*Philemon.*	*Apocalypse of John.*
Galatians.		

Constitutions } *of the Apostles.* { These the Abyssinian Christians possess, but whether as canonical is uncertain. }
Canons }

The *Nestorian Bible* is of course as old as Nestorianism itself, a schism which commenced in the fifth century. That that Bible contains all the O. T. deutero books is conclusively proved by the testimony of Hebedjesu or as it is otherwise written Ebedjesu. This writer who lived in the sixteenth century was a Syrian, and having already embraced the monastic state and distinguished himself as an earnest and learned defender of Nestorianism, was appointed first patriarch of the

Chaldeans. As such having renounced his errors he was afterwards reconciled to the Church. But he had already attained distinction by several works written in the interest of the schism in which he had been educated, of one of these Abraham Echellensis a Syrian scholar published a Latin translation with the Chaldean text at Rome in 1653. It is called by the Author *The Admirable Tract* and proposes to enumerate "the Divine Books," of course as they were contained in the Nestorian Bible, as well as to treat of all the ecclesiastical compositions written up to that time. Let us see then what is said in this rare tract regarding the contents of that Bible. "Trusting, therefore, in God, says the author, so I begin."

"The Law or the Pentateuch five books, Genesis, Exodus, the Book of Priests (Leviticus), Numbers, Deuteronomy, Josue the son of Nun, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Paralipomenon, Job, Psalms, Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Canticle of Canticles, great *Wisdom*, Barasiros, or *Ecclesiasticus*, Isaias, Jeremias, Epistle of *Baruch*, Ezechiel, Daniel, Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Micheas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggeus, Zacharias, Malachias, Hezra, Book of *Tobias and Tobith* just Israelites, *Judith*, Esther, *Daniel minor* (deutero), finally the Books of the *Machabees*." Next after designating some of the Books of "the ancient Hebrews," as "Traditions of the elders," the writings of "Josephus the scribe" etc., the author thus continues: "Having already finished the Old let us come to the New, the beginning of which is Matthew, who wrote in Hebrew in Palestine.

After him Mark spoke in Roman in the celebrated city of Rome.

Luke spoke and wrote in Greek at Alexandria.

John at Ephesus wrote a Gospel in Greek.

Luke also wrote to Theophilus the Acts of Apostles.

Epistles were signed in every character and language by the Apostles, namely, James, Peter, John, and Jude, and they are therefore called Catholic.

Fourteen Epistles of Apostle Paul the great. Epistle to the Romans, which was written from the City of Corinth.

The first Epistle to the Corinthians was written at Ephesus, and sent by the hands of Timothy.

But the second to the Corinthians was written at Philippi, which is in great Macedonia, and sent by the hands of Titus.

And the Epistle to the Galatians Paul himself wrote from the city of Rome, and sent it by the hands of Titus, an elect and approved vessel.

But the Epistle of the Ephesians was written from the city of Rome, and sent by Paul himself through the hands of Tychicus.

That to the Philippians was also written at Rome, and sent by the hands of Apaphroditus the beloved brother.

And that which is addressed to the Colossians, was also written at Rome, and sent by the hands of Tychicus the disciple of truth.

The first to the Thessalonians was written at Athens, and sent by the hands of Timothy. But the second to the Thessalonians was written at Laodicea of Pisidia, and sent by the hands of Luke.

But the first Epistle of Timothy (thus) was written from Laodicea a city of Pisidia, and sent by the hands of Luke.

And the second Epistle of Timothy (thus) was written from the city of Rome, and sent by the hands of Luke, Physician and Evangelist.

And the Epistle to Titus was written at Nicopolis, and sent and delivered by the hands of Apaphroditus.

But Philemon's (thus) was written from the city of Rome, and sent by the hands of Onesimus the slave of that Philemon.

But the Epistle of the Hebrews (thus) was written in Italy, and sent by the hands of Timothy his spiritual son."

Then follows an account of several other writers, not only Nestorians, but Monophysites, Monthhelites and other sectarists, as well as of their works.

In a note on this part of "The Admirable Tract" Echellensis the Translator observes[1] that among the Orientals, copies are rare which contain all the sacred books, because one person

[1] p. 130.

writes out or directs to be written out this part, another, that other part, as guided by his studies, disposition, opportunity, leisure, and resources. Consequently from the various copies, various catalogues are not to be composed, whether as regards the numbers of the books or the order in which they are arranged.

The Russian Bible. Several editions of this volume have appeared from time to time. Among the latest is that of 1882. As already stated,[1] it was published at St. Petersburg, with the sanction of "The Holy Orthodox Synod," a body which regulates the doctrines, discipline, and government of the Russian Church. This Russian Bible includes the following books:

OLD TESTAMENT.

Genesis.
Exodus.
Leviticus.
Numbers.
Deuteronomy.
Book of Joshua Nove.
Book of Judges.
Book of Ruth.
I. Book of Kings.
II. Book of Kings.
III. Book of Kings.
IV. Book of Kings.
I. Book of Paralipomenon.
II. Book of Paralipomenon.
I. Book of Esdras (I. Esdras of Vulgate).
Book of Nehemias.
II. Book of Esdras (III. Apocryphal Esdras in Vulgate).
Book of Tobias.
Book of Judith.
Book of Esther (with the additions).
Book of Job.
Psalter.
Book of Parables of Solomon.
Book of Ecclesiastes, or the Preacher.
Book of Canticle of Canticles of Solomon.
Book of Wisdom of Solomon.
Book of Wisdom of Jesus, Son of Sirach.
Book of the Prophet Isaias.
Book of the Prophet Jeremias.
Book of the Lamentations of Jeremias.
Epistle of Jeremias (Baruch VI.).
Book of the Prophet Baruch.
Book of the Prophet Ezechiel.
Book of the Prophet Daniel (with the additions).
Book of the Prophet Osee.
Book of the Prophet Joel.
Book of the Prophet Amos.
Book of the Prophet Abdias.
Book of the Prophet Jonas.
Book of the Prophet Micheas.
Book of the Prophet Nahum.
Book of the Prophet Habacuc.
Book of the Prophet Sophonias.
Book of the Prophet Aggeus.

[1] p. 236.

OLD TESTAMENT. (*Continued*).

Book of the Prophet Zacharias.
Book of the Prophet Malachias.
I. Book of Machabees.
II. Book of Machabees.
III. Book of Machabees.
III. Book of Esdras (IV. Apocryphal Esdras in Vulgate).

BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Gospel according to St. Matthew.
Gospel to according St. Mark.
Gospel according to St. Luke.
Gospel according to St. John.

ACTS OF THE HOLY APOSTLES.

Epistle of James.
I. Epistle of Peter.
II. Epistle of Peter.
I. Epistle of John.
II. Epistle of John.
III. Epistle of John.
Epistle of Jude.
Epistle to the Romans.
I. Epistle to the Corinthians.
II. Epistle to the Corinthians.
Epistle to the Galatians.
Epistle to the Ephesians.
Epistle to the Philippians.
Epistle to the Colossians.
I. Epistle to the Thessalonians.
II. Epistle to the Thessalonians.
I. Epistle to Timothy.
II. Epistle to Timothy.
Epistle to Titus.
Epistle to Philemon.
Epistle to Hebrews.
Apocalypse of John the Theologian.

This catalogue is a copy of the Index, which, at the end of the Russian Bible exhibits the contents of that volume. The inspired writers of the New Testament are mentioned in this Index without the prefix *Saint*, as is generally the case in the Index of the Vulgate. But, as is also the case in the Vulgate New Testament, that word is prefixed in the Russian New Testament to the name of each writer at the beginning of his Book. In the Russian Bible, as in the copies of the LXX., II. Paralipomenon is immediately followed by the apocryphal prayer of Manasses, and Psalm 150 by the apocryphal psalm of David when he slew Goliath.

It would be easy to exbibit many more catalogues from other manuscripts and printed bibles in various languages. But like these given in this Appendix; those catalogues, while differing somewhat in the order assigned the sacred books, (a point affecting in no way their number), show all of them that

from the oldest in the fourth to the most modern in the nineteenth century; the limits of the Old Testament far exceeded those to which it was reduced by the Protestant reformers, who, in applying their pruning hook to the Bible, lopped off many a fair branch, which, as we have seen, the most advanced scholars among their modern followers confess, deserved to be preserved better than some that they spared. What wonder, then, that, while the Orientals by conciliar action proclaimed the Old Testament deutero books to be part of the divine canon, they unanimously and scornfully rejected the counterfeit canon of the Reformers, which Cyril Lucar, prompted by his Western patrons attempted to introduce in the East?

INDEX.

A.

Aaron, 101, 108, 180, 362.
Abarbanel, 188.
Abbot, George, 206.
Abigail, 187.
Abulbarcatus, 250.
Abyssinians, 196, 250, 251, 252.
Adam, 180, 182.
Adams, Melchior, 452.
Addis, Rev. William E. and Thomas Arnold, 57.
Admirable Tract, 250.
Adrian II. Pope, 219.
Agabus, 185.
Aggeus, 22.
Alabarch, 75.
A Lapide, 48, 57, 180.
Alexander the Great, 36, 49, 98, 169.
Albigensians, 271, 273, 491.
Allen, Cardinal, 380.
Alogians, 268.
Aman, 63, 177, 178.
American counterfeits of Catholic Bibles, 428–433.
Ananelus, 117.
Ananus, 154.
Anastasius, schism. Bishop of Thessalonica, 208.
Anastasius, schism. Metropolitan, 224.
Ancient, 347.
Annas, 117.
Andrea, Jacob, 203.
Anglican *Articles of Religion*, 546.
Anglicans, 205.
Anne de Montmorency, 447.
Anglo Saxon Pontifical, 357.
Anselm, 486, 487.
Anthony of Athens, 213.
Anthony St. the Great, 217.
Antiochus, Epiphanes, 55, 100.
Apelles, 267.
Apocryphal, 8.
Apocryphal war, 509.
Apostolical, 126.
Aquila, 134, 142.
Arians, 270.
Aristeas, 65, 96–100.
Aristobulus, 96, 97, 98.
Ark, 112, 113.
Arnagrimus, 538.
Armenians, 196, 255.
Artaxerxes, 166, 168, 169, 171, 172, 180–186, 189, 194.
Arundel, Thomas, 494.
Assemani, Joseph Simon, 250, 251.
Athanasius, 144.
Audin, 515.
Augustine, St. 199, 265, 269, 610.
Azoff, 209.

B.

Bacon, Francis, 460.
Bacon, Roger, 487.
Bale, 466, 468, 487.
Balsamon, 359.
Barclay, 355, 564.
Barhebraeus, 250, 251.

Barlaam, 224.
Barnabas, 349.
Bartholomew, 213.
Baruch, 52, 126, 144, 150, 151, 213, 216, 229.
Basil, St. 29.
Basil, 271.
Basilides, 266.
Basilidians, 268.
Bath Kol, 186–188.
Baur, 587.
Baxter, 561, 615.
Bechai, 188.
Beekmanites, 522, 523.
Belgic Confession of Faith, 553.
Benassal, 250.
Berchoire's Repertorium, 529.
Bergier, 265.
Bertholdt, 47, 586.
Bertrand du Guesclin, 447.
Beza, 383.
Bible, meaning of, 1, 2.
Bible, Anglo-Catholic or Douay, 381, 412.
Bible, Anglo-Protestant. Tyndale's, 303.
Bible, Anglo-Protestant, Coverdale's, 305.
Bible, Anglo-Protestant, Matthew's 305.
Bible, Anglo-Protestant, Taverner's, 306.
Bible, Anglo-Protestant, Cranmer's, 306.
Bible, Anglo-Protestant, Bishop's, 307.
Bible, Anglo-Protestant, King James,' 308–379.
Bible Societies, 499–513.
Bibles, Catholic between invention of printing and birth of Luther. 456.
Bibles Catholic, German, 438.
" " French, 439.
" " Italian, 439.
" " Spanish, 440.
Bibles Catholic, Portuguese, 440.
" " Flemish, 440.
" " Polish, 441.
" " Bohemian, 441.
" " Slavonic, 441.
" " Hungarian, 442.
" " Syriac, 442.
" " Arabic, 442.
" " Mexican, 442.
" " American Indian, 442.
Bedell, 540.
Bishop of Metz,
Blackmore, 230.
Blake, 411.
Bliss, 467.
Blunt, 471.
Bogomilists, 271.
Bogoris, 218.
Bolten, 289.
Bonn Conferences, 244–249.
Book of Mormon, 579.
Books, expense of, 449.
Boys, John, 383.
Breckenridge and Hughes, 420.
Breckenridge, John, 421.
Brentius, 518.
Brethevold, 477.
Bretschneider, 502.
Brigitte, Queen, 538.
Bristow, 380.
Brentius, 518.
Brownlee, 421.
Broughton, 309.
Bucer, 573.
Bulgarians, 218.
Bull, George, 460.
Burnet, 460, 561.

C.

Caiphas, 118, 185.
Calmet, 48, 100, 121.
Calvin, John, 289.
Calvinists, 205.

Canon defined, 2.
Canon, the Catholic, 4.
" the Jewish, 14–70.
" the Protestant, 547–559.
" the Hellonistic, 50, 70, 72, 159.
" or Palestinian, 70, 81, 159.
Canonical and canonized, 10.
Canons of the Apostles, 359.
Canstein, 509.
Canticles, 9, 58.
Capito, 518.
Catalogue of Books in Vatican Codex, 640.
Catalogue of Books in Sinaitic Codex, 641.
Catalogue of Books in Alexandrine Codex, 642.
Catalogue of Books in Codex Rescriptus Ephremi, 644.
Catalogue of Books in Ethiopic Version, 645.
Catalogue of Books in Nestorian Bible, 646.
Catalogue of Books in Russian Bible, 649.
Cataphrygians, 268.
Cathai, 271.
Catholic Dictionary, 58, 71, 237.
Cerdo, 267.
Cerinthus, 266.
Cerularius, 220.
Challoner, Bishop, 402.
Charlemagne, 446.
Chamber's Book of Days, 276.
Chazari, 218.
Christians judaizing, 155.
Chrysostom, St. John, 27.
Chemnitz, 288, 573.
Clarke, Adam, 73, 185, 344.
Classes of Books by Christians, 5–14.
Classes of Books by Jews, 17–21.
Claudius, 185.
Clement of Rome, 157, 607.
Clement of Alexandria, 24, 607.
Cleopatra, 174, 175.
Cludius, 587.
Cocas, Joasaph, 222.
Codex Paulinus, 541.
Cohen, 360, 361.
Colenso, 587.
Comestor's Scholastic History, 529.
Congregation of the Index, 514.
Contari, Cyril, 208, 210.
Convent of St. Edmondsburg, 480.
Convocation of Canterbury, 242, 321.
Conwell, Bishop, 415.
Copts, 196, 250.
Cornely, 53, 83, 159, 171, 236, 237.
Cossacks, 209.
Council, V. Ecumenical, 69.
" Schismatical at Constantinople, 212.
Council, Schismatical at Jerusalem, 213, 359.
Council of Laodicea, 229.
" of Trent, 4, 80, 158, 202, 597.
" Neo Cæsarea, 359.
" in Trullo, 202, 359.
" of Nice, 359.
" of Florence, 202, 221.
" Toulouse, 492.
" of Tarragona, 493.
" I. Provincial of Baltimore, 437.
" II. Plenary of Baltimore, 437, 533.
Coverdale, 305, 378, 385, 389.
Coyne, 401.
Cozri, Book of, 188.
Cranmer, 470, 475.
Credner, 587.
Crete, 205.
Critopulus Metrophanes, 206 210, 211, 360.
Crolly, Archbishop, 41.
Cromwell, 313.
Crucius, 203, 204.

Curoe, 411.
Cyclopedia, Kitto's, 78.
Cyprian St. Bishop of Carthage, 608.
Cyril, schism. Patriarch of Constantinople, 208.
Cyril and Methodius, SS. 213, 539.
Cyril, St. Bishop of Alexandria, 608.
Cyrus, King of Persia, 21, 36.

D.

Dahl, 587.
Damascus, 191.
Danes, 483.
Daniel the Prophet, 29, 36.
Daniel, Anglican Archbishop of Tuam, 540.
Daniel, Russian Bishop, 224.
Danko, 56, 70, 171, 191.
Darius Codomanus, 33.
Darius Hystaspes, 33.
D'Aubigne, 452–461.
David, 155, 187.
David le Leu de Wilhelm, 506.
Davidson, 60, 61, 73, 74, 77, 255, 276, 277, 310, 458, 558, 592.
Debora, 181.
Declaration of Catholic Principles, 530.
Demetrius Phalereus, 97–99.
De Nointel, 216.
De Wette, 47, 586.
Denvir, Bishop, 411.
Diana of the Ephesians, 326.
Diakonos, 346.
Diesterick, 587.
Dionysius, schism. Patriarch of Constantinople, 213, 222.
Dixon's Introduction, 213.
Dollinger, 244, 515.
Dolscius, 202.
Domitian, 155.
Donatists, 270.
Dositheus, Jewish Priest, 174, 175.
Dositheus, schism. Patriarch of Jerusalem, 212, 214, 215.
Douay Version 369.
Doyle, Bishop, 421.
Dragon, History of, 215.
Drusius, 460.
Dublin Review, 191, 504.
Dubois, Bishop, 416.
Dulia, 314.
Dumoulin, 301.
Duncan Dunbar, 421.
Dunce, 466.
Dutch Confession of Faith, 554.
Duvoisin, 186.

E.

Ebed Jesu, 250.
Ebion, 266.
Ebionites, 156, 258.
Eccleston, Archbishop, 415, 424.
Ecclesiastes, 58, 69, 144, 156.
Ecclesiastical, 10.
Ecclesiasticus, 58, 66, 68, 82, 84, 124, 150, 151, 169, 213, 215, 216, 259.
Echellensis, Abraham, 250.
Edward VI. 313.
Eichorn, 286.
Elcesaeus, 266.
Eleazar, 72, 100, 102, 118.
Elder and *Elders*, 123, 147.
Elizabeth, wife of Zachary, 183, 184.
Elizabeth, Queen, 320.
Emser, 291, 292.
Ephrem, St. 150, 251.
Epiphanius, St. 127, 136, 144, 265, 269.
Episcopos, 345, 346.
Esdras, the Scribe, 46, 50, 51, 54–57, 59, 65, 67, 70, 87–89, 109–111, 140, 144, 146, 161.
Esdras III., Apocryphal, 76, 151, 171.
Esdras, Pseudo IV. 23–29, 33, 48, 49, 63, 66, 151, 270, 281.

Essenes, 123, 347.
Esther, 14, 46–52, 54, 58-60, 63, 78, 125, 143, 144, 146, 148–150, 172–176.
Eugenius IV. Pope, 221.
Eusebius, 26, 98, 265, 269.
Eutychians, 270.
Ezechiel, 9, 69, 144, 590.

F.

Fagius. Paul, 383.
Feast of Tabernacles, 65.
Feodore I. of Russia, 225, 226.
Ferrer Boniface, 537.
Frederic Barbarossa, 447.
Fitzpatrick, Bishop, 424.
Fitz Ralph, Bishop, 540.
Formusus, Bishop of Porto, 218.
Forshall and Madden, 281, 282.
Fox, John, 471, 475.
Franzelin, 53, 71, 171.
Fraser, John, 582.
Frassen, 56, 70.
Freeman, Charles P. 520.
Friar Bartholy, 518.

G.

Gallic Confession of Faith, 553.
Gamaliel, 120.
Garizim, temple of, 75, 101, 106.
Gaussen, 573.
Gelaktion, 225.
Gemara, 32.
Gemara, Jerusalem, 132.
Genebrard, 52, 70.
Gennadius, Russian Bishop, 224.
Genoa, 206.
Germanus, Russian ecclesiastic, 224.
Gildas the Wise, 357.
Gibson, Dr. 407.
Glassius, Solomon, 460.
Gnostics, 268.
Godounov, Boris, 225, 226.
Godfrey, Abbot of Malmesburg, 479.
Gorpiæus, 127.
Grabe, 270, 550.
Greeks, 196, 199, 203, 205, 206.
Greek Synod, 204.
Greek Church, 204.
Gregory VII. St. Pope, 220.
Gregory, schism. Patriarch of Constantinople. 222.
Gregory, Abyssinian Abbot. 252.
Gregory, Martin. 380.
Gregory XIII. Pope, 436.
Gregory XVI. Pope.
Griesbach, 335.
Grosseteste, 486.
Grotius, 289, 383, 460.
Guericke, 587.
Gunaika, 329.

H.

Hadrian, 37, 135.
Hagar, 187.
Hagiographa, 18, 69.
Hallam, 279, 391, 447, 451, 492, 569
Haneberg, 171.
Havercamp, 170.
Haydock, Rev. George, 408.
Heard, 217, 220, 221.
Hebrew Bible, 134.
Hebrew letters, 67.
Hebrew 22 Books, 15.
Hebrew names, 337, 342.
Hedwige, St. 538.
Heinsius, Daniel and Nicholas, 460.
Helcias, 91.
Heli, 39.
Hellenistic Jews, 51, 84, 105, 109, 122, 144, 148, 196, 198.
Helvetic Confession of Faith, 552,
Henry VIII. 313, 465, 470.
Herbaud, 447.
Hereford, 281.
Hermas, Book of, 594.

Herod, 117, 118, 123, 183, 186.
Hiereus, 358, 361, 363.
High Priest, 89–92, 94–96, 99–103, 105, 108, 109, 112, 115–117, 121, 122, 130, 143, 148, 160, 163, 175, 182, 183, 187, 191, 193.
Hilary, St. 126, 144.
Hillel, 51, 69, 123.
Hody, Humphrey, 100, 132, 170, 235, 251, 255, 460.
Holda, 92.
Holy Ghost, 187, 189, 196.
Horne, Thomas Hartwell, 384, 388, 471, 474, 487, 492.
Horrabin, 408.
Horreum Mysteriorum, 251.
Huet, 55, 70, 82, 83.
Hughes, Bishop, 423, 424.
Hugo a Sancto Caro, 487.
Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, 451.
Husenbeth, Dr. 408.
Huss, John, 538.
Huther, 587.
Hyperdulia, 314.

I.

Ignatius, St. 607.
Innocent III. Pope, 488–491.
Irenæus, St. 265, 269, 601.
Ishmæl, High Priest, 118.
Isiaslif. 220.
Isidore, St. of Seville, 28, 127.
Isidore, Metropolitan of Moscow, 223.
Isidore, St. of Pelusium, 612.
Ivan III. 224.
Ivan IV. the Terrible, 224, 225.

J.

Jacobites, 136, 250.
John, 82.
James, St. the Less, 121, 153, 155, 190.
James a Voragine, 537.
Jamnia, 68.
Januarius, St. 631.
Jean de Vignes, 537.
Jeddoa, Jadus or Jaddua, 35, 48, 49.
Jeremiah I. schism. Patriarch of Constantinople, 222.
Jeremiah II. schism. Patriarch of Constantinople, 222, 225, 226.
Jeremias the Prophet, 29, 87, 89.
Jeremias, Anglican Bishop, 238.
Jerome, St. 9, 15, 27, 98, 127, 142, 145, 173, 276.
Jerome schism. Bishop of Chalcedon, 213.
Jesuits, 207.
Jethro, 38.
Jerusalem, Temple of, 83, 103, 104.
Joachim, errorist, 273.
Joachim schism. Bishop of Rhodes, 213.
Joadda, 48.
Joasaph II. schism. Patriarch of Constantinople, 222.
Job, Book of, 69.
John Hyrcanus, 57, 119, 183.
John the Baptist, 185
John Evangelist, 185.
John, King of Bohemia, 447.
John le Clerc, 460.
John Gottlob Carpzov, 460.
John Henry Pareau, 460.
John David Michaelis, 460.
John de Trevisa, 471.
John, Bishop of Bath, 478.
John of Salisbury, 486, 487.
Jonathan, 48, 175.
Jones, Jeremiah, 560.
Josaphat, 94.
Joseph Ben Gorion, 100, 172.
Joseph, High Priest, 118.
Joseph of Arimathea, 120.
Joseph, Russian Bishop of Kolomna, 225.

Josephus, Historian, 41, 47, 52, 63, 65, 66, 73, 76, 83, 95, 96, 104, 106, 107, 116–118, 121, 149, 165, 167, 169–172, 176, 180–186, 188–193, 338.
Josias, 92, 93.
Jost, 105.
Josue, 181.
Josue Samaritan Book of, 101.
Jozar, Jewish Priest, 121.
Juda the Levite, 188.
Judas the Essene, 57, 87–89, 183.
Judas Machabeus, 55–57, 63.
Judith, 9, 52, 151, 169, 213, 215, 216, 259.
Justin Martyr, St. 125, 130, 132, 154, 596–607.
Justinian, 138.

K.

Kay, David, F. R. S. 253.
Kenrick, Archbishop, 403, 415, 423–425.
Kern, 587.
Kiew, Metropolitan See of, 223.
King James I. 206, 312, 324.
Kistemacher, Binterim, 503.
Konissky, George, 230.

L.

Langfranc, 486, 487.
Lange, 587.
Latria, 314.
Langton, 486, 487.
Layton, 466.
Le Long, 536.
Leo XIII. Pope, 503.
Leonard, Archbishop, 414.
Leonidas, Archbishop of Novogorod, 224.
Leontius, 29.
Leontopolis, Temple of, 75, 83, 106, 161.
Lindsey, Mr. Charles, 522.
Liddell, and Scott, 329.
Lingard, 279, 409.
Lisosius, Sactarist, 271.
Lonicer, 77.
Louis de Dieu, 383, 460.
Louis of Bavaria, 447.
Lollardism, 493.
Louth, Robert, 460.
Lucar, Cyril, 205, 216, 222, 228, 237.
Lucifer, Bishop of Cagliari, 609.
Lucke, 587.
Ludolf, Job, 252.
Luther, 58, 77, 146, 283–289, 291, 292, 378, 452–456, 518, 569, 593.
Lutherans, 205.
Lutheran Consistory, 510.
Lynch Law, 519, 582.
Lysimachus, 174–176.

M.

Machabees, 84, 118, 150, 151, 169, 213, 215.
Macharius, schism. Patriarch of Antioch, 215.
Mac Knight, Presbyterian Minister, 301–302.
Maclay, Archibald, 421.
Magdala, Scriptures at, 253.
Mai, Cardinal, 536.
Maimonides, 186, 188.
Maitland, 449, 451, 453, 468, 478, 485.
Malachias, 22, 35, 168, 181, 182.
Manahen, 183, 184.
Manes, 267.
Manicheans, 268.
Manoah, 187.
Manuscript, Vatican, 77, 92, 150.
" Sinaitic, 77, 150.
" Alexandrian, 77, 150.
" Parisian, 77, 150.
Marchesini, Mammotrectus, 529.
Marcion, 267.
Marcionites, 268.

Mark of Ephesus, 221.
Marsh, Anglican Bishop, 80 262, 502.
Marsh, George F., 279.
Marshal, T. W. M. 506.
Martini, Archb'p, 435.
Martyrs of Poland and Russia, 225.
Mathesius, John, 452.
Massecah, 315.
Mary, God's Mother, 183.
Mayerhoff, 587.
McCloskey, Bishop, 424.
McHale, Archb'p, 412.
McMahon, Rev. Bernard, 410.
McMahon, Rev. James, 424.
McNamara, 400, 401, 402, 417.
Meister, Anna, 522.
Melancthon, 202, 203, 518.
Melchisedech, 34.
Melito, 125, 130, 143, 144, 596.
Messiah, 115. 127. 134, 137, 158, 164.
Methodius, schism. Bishop of Pisidia, 213.
Metrophanes, schism. Bishop of Cyzicum, 213.
Metrophanes, schism. Patriarch of Constantinople, 222.
Michael III. or Bogoris, 218.
Miesrob, 254.
Migne, 180.
Milman, 121.
Milner, Isaac, 453.
Milner, Bishop, 515.
Milton, John, 460.
Mink, James, 520.
Mishna, 32.
Mogila, schism. Metropolitan of Moscow, 228, 229.
Montanus, 267.
Moravians, 219.
Mordechai, 177, 178.
Moore, Sir Thomas, 280, 470, 475.
Moscow, Russian Metropolitan See, 223.
Moses, 5, 19, 22, 26, 29, 30, 37, 90–93, 109, 112, 115, 116, 118–120, 123, 127, 129, 146, 155, 162, 163, 166, 167, 180, 362.
Movers, 56, 70, 75.
Murray, Archb'p, 408, 410.
Muscovite Bible, 235, 236.
Mysias Demetrius, schism. Deacon of Constantinople, 202, 203.

N.

Names of the Sacred Books, 3.
Nary, Rev. Cornelius, 402.
Natalis, Alexander, 265.
Nazarites, 155.
Neander, 587.
Nectarius, schism. Patriarch of Jerusalem, 229.
Nehemias, 22, 40, 45, 46, 48, 49, 56, 57, 66, 67, 87–89, 181.
Neophyte, schism. Patriarch of Antioch. 216.
Nestorians, 196, 250. 270.
Neteler, 56, 57, 70.
Neudecker, 587.
Newman, Cardinal, 403.
Newton, Isaac, 460.
Nicholas I., Pope, 218.
Nicholas, Czar, 231.
Nicholas de Lyra, 294.
Nicholson, John, 254.
Nicodemus, 120.
Nicomedia, bay of, 209.
Nikon, Russian Patriarch, 225.
Nitika, St., 217.
Non Jurors, 238.
Normans, 484.
Novella, 139.
Nyphon, 222.

O.

Oil, 354.
Olshausen, 587.
Onias High Priest at Leontopolis, and

rightful High Priest at Jerusalem, 75, 83, 103, 107, 175.
Origen, 8, 126, 144, 596, 605.
Osee, the Prophet, 181.
Ozias, King of Juda, 181.

P.

Pacome, schism. Patriarch of Constantinople, 222.
Padua, 205, 206.
Palestinian Jews, 109, 122, 144, 148, 177.
Pandits, 505.
Parthenius, schism. Patriarch of Constantinople, 213, 236.
Patton, Wm., 421.
Paul, Apostle, 185, 191, 349.
Paul, Bishop of Populania, 218.
Paul, Monophysite Bishop of Tela, 251.
Paulus, 587.
Pega, Melitius, schism. Patriarch of Alexandria, 206.
Pelagians, 270.
Pella, 154.
Peschito, 197.
Pesel, 315.
Peter the Great, 227.
Petit Radel, 450.
Pharisees, 119, 155, 165, 184.
Philaret, schism. Metropolitan of Moscow, 232, 237.
Philastrius, 265, 269.
Philip, Metropolitan, 224.
Philip the Hardy, 447.
Philo, 52, 63–65, 73, 96, 98, 182, 185, 186.
Photius, 205, 206.
Pinkerton, John, 460, 542.
Pius VI., Pope.
Pius VII., Pope, 503.
Pius VIII., Pope, 503.
Pius IX., Pope, 503.
Pollio, 183.
Pope and Maguire, 418.
Popes, 196, 209.
Poynter, 407.
Presbuteros, 347–364.
Prideaux, 46, 59, 60, 73, 104, 170, 199.
Priost, 357.
Propaganda, S. Cong. of, 437.
Protestant Bibles, 133.
Proto-canonical and Deutero-canonical, 15.
Proverbs, 69, 144.
Ptolemy, 53.
Ptolemy Philadelphus, 72, 82, 97, 99, 100, 101.
Ptolemy Philometer, 97, 103, 122, 174–176.
Ptolemy, 174.
Purcell and Campbell, 420.
Purcell, Archb'p, 424.
Purim, 63, 82, 174, 177, 178.
Purvey, 281.

R.

R. Akiba, 69, 35.
R. Eleazar, 69.
R. Johanan, 69.
R. Juah, 68.
R. Simeon, 69
R. Simon, 68.
Rabbins, 44, 66, 69, 83, 130, 133, 137, 139, 140–143, 145, 156, 163, 167, 168, 178, 179, 186.
Rab. Juda, 34.
R. Moses, 187.
Ralph Bishop of Rochester, 478.
Ralph de Baudoke dean of London, 479.
Raoul de Presles, 537.
Raphael, aspirant to the schism. patriarchate of Constantinople, 222.
Rappe, Bishop, 424.
Reinkins, 245.
Reuss, Professor, 46, 58, 235, 587.

Revisers of the "authorized version," 341, 369.
Reviser of the "Revisers," 365.
Renaudot, 215, 257.
Reynolds, Bishop, 424.
Richard of Bury, 451.
Richard Rolle, the Hermit of Hampole, 476.
Richard Simon, 53, 59.
Richard of St. Victor, 486, 487.
Rigby, Dr. 407.
Rigdon, Sidney, 580
Roman Pontiff, 199, 201.
Roberts, Dr. Alexander, 365.
Robertson, Historian, 454.
Rosenmullers, 460.
Ruissvich, Herman, 282.
Russians, 196, 217-250.

S.

Sacerd, 358.
Sacerdos, 360, 361.
Sadducees, 119,
Salmasius, 289, 460.
Samaritans, 100, 101, 104.
Samuel the Prophet, 39, 181.
Sanballat, 48.
Sanhedrim, 22, 32, 33, 35, 49, 50, 75, 119, 121.
Saturninus, 266.
Saul or Paul, Apostle, 43.
Saxon Chronicle, 480.
Scaliger, 289.
Schismatics, 196.
Schleiermacher, 587.
Schneckenberger, 587.
Schmidt, 586.
Schott, 587.
Schrader, 587.
Schultz, 587.
Schwegler, 587.
Schweinfurth, George Jacob, 521-526.
Scotch Kirk, 510.
Scribes, 123.
Scrivener, 386.
Semitic characters, 67.
Semler, 586.
Senior, 347.
Septuagint, 72, 77, 79, 80, 81, 100, 109, 132, 134, 136, 137, 141, 142, 152, 159, 160, 168, 186, 192-194.
Serarius, 53.
Severus, Bishop of Ashmonin, 258.
Shakespeare's father, 448.
Shammai, 51, 68, 123.
Shea, John Gilmary, L.L.D.
Sheol, 322.
Simon the Just, 35, 36, 46, 51, 59, 66, 110.
Simon, High Priest, 118.
Simon Magus, 156, 265, 351.
Simon Peter, Apostle. 351.
Simonians, 268.
Sindon, 394.
Sixtus of Sienna, 13.
Slavonic alphabet, 219.
Slavonic Bible, 219.
Smith, Professor, 47, 58, 75, 132, 170, 194, 201, 336, 616.
Smith, J. B. 520.
Smith, Joseph, 579.
Solemn League and Covenant, 408.
Sousa, Emanuel, 537.
Southcott, Joanna, 516.
St. Germain de Pres, 213.
Spalding, Solomon, 579.
Spinoza, 47.
Stackhouse, Anglican Vicar of Benham, 74.
Stephen, St., Proto-martyr, 73, 191.
Stephen, sectarist, 271.
Stevenson, J., S. J., 281, note 2.
Sublime Porte, 207, 216.
Sultan, 207, 222, 224, 225.
Susanna, History of, 214, 215.
Symmachus, 136.

Swedenborg, 460, 577.
Swiss Declaration of Faith, 556.
Synod schismatical at Jassy, 212.
Synod schismatical at Constantinople, 213.
Synod schismatical at Jerusalem, 214.
Synod at Oxford, 494.
Syers, Oswald, 408.
Synopsis, Athanasian, 27.
Syriga, Miletius, 229.

T.

Talmud, 31, 73, 128, 163, 188.
Tatian, 267.
Tertullian, 27, 132, 265, 268, 602.
Testament, Old and New, 3.
Testament of the twelve Apostles, 487.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 69.
Theodosius 178.
Theodotian, 136.
Thebutis, 155.
Theophanes, schism. Patriarch of Jerusalem.
Theoptus, schism. Patriarch of Constantinople, 223.
Thomas and Valentine, 538.
Timon, Bishop, 424.
Timothy, schism. Patriarch of Constantinople, 207.
Titus, Roman Emperor, 108, 154.
Tobias, 9, 30, 52, 150, 169, 213, 214, 216.
Tournemine, 53, 71.
Trajan, Roman Emperor, 155.
Troy, Archb'p, 400, 401, 410.
Trypho, 131, 192, 193.
Tver, Russian Archb'p, 224.
Tyndale, apostate priest, 303, 325, 379, 385, 389.

U.

Ubaldi, 70, 82, 187.
Ullman, 587.
Ulphilas, 536.
Ungnad, David, 203.
Usher, Anglican Archb'p, 475, 538.
Urim and Thummim, 186, 187.
Uytenbogaert, 206.

V.

Valentinians, 268.
Van Ess, Leander, 502, 511.
Vassili IV., Russian Prince, 224.
Versions of the Scriptures,
- Vetus Itala, 78, 219, 228.
- Vulgate, 381, 385.
- Ethiopic, 151, 200.
- Gothic, 151.
- Armenian, 151, 200.
- Syriac Hexaplar, 151.
- Slavonic, 197.
- Arabic, 200.
- Anglo-Catholic, 380–398.
- Anglo Protestant, 303–379.
- Other Protestant, 275–303.

Vespasian, Roman Emperor, 107, 15, 165.
Vincenzi, 53, 71, 82.
Vladimir, 219, 220.
Vogel, 587.
Voltaire, 220.
Von Hagen, Cornelius, 206, 208.
Von Hurter, Frederic, 490.

W.

Wake, Anglican Archb'p, 240.
Waldensians, 272.
Waldensian Confession of Faith, 553.
Walker Obadias, 276.
Walsh, Rev. P. A. 400.
Walter, Bishop of Rochester, 478.
Walton, Brian, Ang. Bishop, 73, 182, 198, 199, 261, 383, 460, 517.
Washington May, 521.
Ward's Errata, 311.
Wassali III., Russian Prince, 223.
Waring Dr., 408.
Weber, 587.
Wentworth, T. & Laura 521.

Westminster Confession of Faith, 553.
Whelan, Bishop, 424.
Whiston, 126, 290, 550.
Whitfield, Archb'p, 416.
Whitaker, John, 564.
William de Longchamp, 479.
William de Schorham, 476.
Wittenberg, 202.
Wisdom, 52, 150, 151. 169, 213, 214, 216, 259.
Wiseman, Cardinal, 409.
Witham, Dr., 402.
Withred, King of Kent, 447.
Wood, Anthony, 467, 468, 472.
Wright, Anglican Dr., 46, 81, 262, 275, 384, 549.
Worcester's Dictionary, 389.
Worthington, Dr., 381.
Wulstan, Bishop of Rochester, 481.
Wyckliffe, 269–282, 463, 493.

X.

Xavier, Francis, St., 631.
Xylocarabœus, Mark, schism, Patriarch of Constantinople.

Z.

Zacharias the Prophet, 22, 40.
Zachary, Father of John the Baptist, 184.
Zempirick, John, 521.
Zeuss, German Celtic scholar, 541.
Zorobabel, 21, 40.
Zosimus, Russian Metropolitan, 224.
Zuinglius, 292.

St. Albert's College Library

72

730.11
M84

Mathews

AUTHOR

The Canon of the Old

TITLE